



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARTICLE IV.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM ORIGINAL SOURCES TO OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE SCIENCE OF MUSLIM TRADITION.

BY EDWARD E. SALISBURY.

Presented to the Society Oct. 27, 1859.

THE desire to know more of early Muslim history, especially as determined by the character and actions of Muḥammad, has naturally directed attention, of late years, to Muslim tradition as the most important source of knowledge on this subject, next to the Kurān; and the working of this mine, with such critical tact as Weil, Sprenger, and Muir have brought to the task, has led to very valuable results. Meanwhile, however, the system of tradition developed among the Muslims themselves into a special science, and constituting one of the main foundations of their faith and jurisprudence, has been, comparatively, little dwelt upon. It seems, indeed, to have been deliberately slighted, in the praiseworthy earnestness of criticism to avoid being led by it to erroneous conclusions. Yet, without surrendering our right of independent judgment upon the veraciousness of traditional statements, we may certainly profit by investigating the system within which they have been enshrined and handed down to us—even if it be regarded only as a manifestation of the genius and grade of scientific culture of the people to whom we are indebted for them; and as constituting an indispensable basis, whether well or ill laid, of actual doctrinal belief and legal decision in all Muslim countries—the source of multifarious laws, usages, and dogmas of the followers of Muḥammad, supplementary to the Kurān, like the Jewish Mishna in relation to the Scriptures of the Old Testament. With this view are offered for consideration the following contributions to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition, which have been gathered from original sources, either only in manuscript or so little accessible as to

be nearly equivalent to unpublished authorities—we say, contributions, because we do not pretend to have exhausted the subject.

The sources from which we have chiefly drawn are:

1. The *Sahih* of 'al-Bukhârî, in MS., being the copy numbered 28 in the *Bibliothèque de M. le Bn Silvestre de Sacy*, Tome 3^{me}; where, however, the notice of this manuscript erroneously represents it as containing only a portion of the work. The author died A. H. 256;
2. Muslim's preface to his collection of traditions, *'al-Musnad 'as-Sahih*, lithographed at Dehli. This author died A. H. 261;
3. A treatise on the principles of tradition by the Saiyid 'Alî 'aj-Jurjânî, lithographed at Dehli in 1849–50, and prefixed to an edition of 'at-Tarmidhî traditions, *'aj-Jâmi' 'as-Sahih*, also lithographed at Dehli. 'Aj-Jurjânî died A. H. 816;
4. An introductory explanation of some of the technical terms of the science of tradition by 'Abd 'al-Hakk, prefixed to an edition of *Mishkât 'al-Masâbîh* lithographed at Dehli in 1851–52. The author was associated with Sprenger in editing a Dictionary of the Technical Terms used in the Sciences of the Musalmans, which forms a part of the *Bibliotheca Indica*:

these we shall refer to, in our citations, by the letters B, M, J, and H, respectively.

Hâjî Khalfah* defines the science of tradition to be the means of a discriminating knowledge of the sayings of the Prophet, together with his actions and his circumstances—وَهُوَ عِلْمٌ يَعْرَفُ بِهِ أَقْوَالُ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ—and divides it into two parts: 1. the science of the reporting of tradition—الْعِلْمُ بِرِوَايَةِ الْحَدِيث—which treats of the conditions under which a tradition is considered as reaching back to the Prophet, and 2. the science of the understanding of tradition—الْعِلْمُ بِدِرَابَةِ الْحَدِيث—which treats of the meaning of a particular tradition, as ascertained by its language, by reference to the fixed principles of Muslim law, or by the analogy of known circumstances relating to the Prophet. The definitions and statements which we have here to present relate chiefly to the former part of the science.

The ultimate criterion of the quality of the report of any tradition is made up of the personal character and attainments of its reporters. It will be proper, then, to begin by distinguishing several grades of traditionists, as we find them stated in the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* etc., already referred to:†

1. the inquirer—

الطالب وَهُوَ الْمُبْتَدِي الرَّاغِبُ فِيهِ

“the inquirer, that is, the beginner, the seeker after tradition”—

* *Lex.*, iii. 28, ed. Fluegel.

† p. 27.

a class represented in the early times of Islâm by followers of the Prophet ardently enthusiastic for the preservation of every memorial of him, who sometimes undertook long and perilous journeys for the sake of securing a single tradition, or of hearing it from the lips of a particular reporter: the class of pupils in tradition, of every age, who of course are not relied upon for any traditional statement; 2. the traditionist—

ثُمَّ الْمُحَدِّثُ وَهُوَ الْأَسْتَاذُ الْكَامِلُ وَكَذَا الشَّيْخُ وَالْأَمَامُ بِعْنَاهُ

“the traditionist, that is, the accomplished teacher, also called the shaikh and the imâm, with the same meaning”—

but whose teachings are at second hand, for the designation of this special title is more fully defined as follows:*

هُوَ مَنْ يَكُونُ كَتَبَ وَقَرَأً وَسَمِعَ وَوَعَى وَرَحَلَ إِلَى الْمَدَابِينَ وَالْقَرَى وَحَصَلَ أَصْوَلًا وَعَلَقَ فَرِوْعَا مِنْ كَتَبِ الْمَسَانِيدِ وَالْعَلَلِ وَالْتَّوَارِيخِ الَّتِي تَقْرَبُ مِنَ الْفَ تَصْنِيفٍ وَقَبْلَ مِنْ تَحْمِلِ الْحَدِيثِ رَوْاْيَةً وَاعْتَنَى بِهِ دَرَائِيَةً

“he is one who has been a writer and reader of tradition, and has heard it and committed it to memory, journeying to cities and towns, and who has summed up principles, and noted special rules, from books of sustained tradition, of archaeology and of history, to the number of nearly a thousand; according to another definition, one who takes up tradition as reported, and is solicitous that it should be known;”

3. the magnate in learning—

ثُمَّ الْحَالِيْطُ وَهُوَ الَّذِي أَحْاطَ عِلْمَهُ بِمَائِيْدَةِ الْفَ حَدِيثٍ مَتَنًا وَاسْنَادًا وَاحْوَالًا
رَوْاْيَةً جَرَحًا وَتَعْدِيْلًا وَتَارِيْخًا

“the magnate in learning, who is one whose knowledge embraces both the text (المتن) and the allegation of authority (الاسناد) of a hundred thousand traditions, together with the circumstances pertaining to reporters, constituting the ground for their rejection or approval, and their history”—

differing from the traditionist only in the extent of his acquisitions in the science; 4. the responsible teacher—

ثُمَّ الْحَاجَةُ وَهُوَ الَّذِي أَحْاطَ عِلْمَهُ بِتَلْثِيمِيْةِ الْفَ حَدِيثٍ وَقَالَ لِلْجَرَرِيِّ
رَحْمَهُ اللَّهُ الْرَّاوِيِّ نَافِلُ الْحَدِيثِ بِالْأَسْنَادِ وَلَمْ يَحْدُثْ مِنْ تَحْمِلِ بِرَوْاْيَتِهِ وَاعْتَنَى
بِدَرَائِيَّتِهِ وَالْحَافِظُ مِنْ رَوْيٍ مَا يَصْلُبُ إِلَيْهِ وَوَعَى مَا يَجْتَنِبُ إِلَيْهِ

“the responsible teacher, that is, one whose knowledge embraces three hundred thousand traditions according to 'aj-Jazârî , the reporter, the authoritative transmitter of tradition, while the traditionist is one who takes up tradition on its report, and is solicitous that it should

* *Dict. Techn. Terms*, p. 282.

be known, and the memorist (الخاطف) is he who reports what reaches him, and keeps in mind whatever may be of use."

This highest class of traditionists is made up of those whose names may be properly given as authorities for tradition, and who are alone relied upon for what is called sound tradition, as distinguished from that which is fair and that which is weak.

The inquiry now arises, what are the necessary qualifications of the responsible teacher? They are, in brief, integrity (العدالة) and retentiveness (الصبط). The first of these is thus defined by J. :*

فالعدالة أن يكون الروى بالغا مسلما عاقلا سليما من أسباب الفسق و خوارم المرأة

"integrity consists in the reporter's being of full age, a Muslim, intelligent, and void of tendencies to impiety and the vagaries of opinion;" and again :

ولا يشترط الذكورة ولا للحرية ولا العلم بفقهه وغريبيه ولا البصر ولا العدد و يعرف العدالة بتنصيص عدلين عليها او بالاستفاضة

"the being of the male sex is not made a condition, nor freedom, nor knowledge of the jurisprudence based upon tradition, or of any thing foreign to the subject, nor sight, nor the being one of many; and integrity is determined by the affirmation of two upright men, or by common rumor;"

and by H. as follows :†

والعدالة ملامة في الشخص تحمله على ملامة التقى والمرأة والمراد بالتقى اجتناب الاعمال السيئة من الشرك والفسق والبدعة وفي الاجتناب عن الصغيرة خلاف والماختار عدم اشتراطه خروجه عن الطاقة الا الاصرار عليها تكونه كبيرة والمراد بالمرأة النتنزء عن بعض لحسايس والنقاييس التي في خلاف مقتضى الهمة والمرأة مثل بعض المباحثات الدينية كالأكل والشرب في السوق والبول في الطريق وامتثال ذلك وينبغي أن يعلم أن عدل الرواية أعم من عدل الشهادة فان عدل الشهادة مخصوص بالآخر وعدل الرواية يشتمل على الحر والعبد

"integrity is an acquisition which impels the person possessing it to act with decision and manliness—meaning by 'decision' the turning away from the evil deeds of idolatry, impiety, and heresy (whether even a little fault must be avoided, is undetermined: it is preferable to regard this as not required, because exceeding the bounds of possibility; except that persistence in a small fault is inadmissible, because it constitutes a

great one), and meaning by 'manliness' exemption from certain grossnesses and vices which shock the sensibility and judgment, for example, certain acts of sensual license, such as eating and drinking in the market, making water in the highway, and the like: it is proper to be known, also, that integrity with reference to the reporting of tradition is less restricted than integrity in testimony; for integrity in testimony is predictable only of the free man, whereas integrity in the reporting of tradition may pertain to the slave as well as the free man."

Of the other qualifications we have the following definitions. J. says:*

والصبط أن يكون منيقظا حافظا غير مغفل ولا ساه ولا شك في حالي التحمل والاداء فان حدث عن حفظه ينبغي أن يكون حافظا وان حدث عن كتابه ينبغي أن يكون ضابطا له وان حدث بالمعنى ينبغي أن يكون عارفا بما يختلف به المعنى

"retentiveness consists in the reporter's being observant and mindful, not heedless nor careless, nor dubious, whether in taking up tradition or in reciting it; for, if he gives out tradition by his memory, he must needs be mindful, and if he gives it out by his book, he must firmly hold to that, and if by the sense, he must know how to seize the sense;"

and also :

ويعرف الصبط بان يعتبر روايته بروايات الثقات المعروفيين بالصبط فان وافقهم غالبا وكانت مخالفته لهم نادرة عرف كونه ضابطا ثبتا

"and retentiveness is determined upon comparison of one's report with the report of reliable authorities, known for their retentiveness; so that, if he agrees with them for the most part, and rarely disagrees, he is known to be certainly retentive;"

and H. says:†

والمراد بالصبط حفظ المسموع وتنبئه من الغوات والاختلال بحيث يتمكن من استحضاره وهو قسمان ضبط الصدر وضبط الكتاب فضبط الصدر حفظ القلب ووعيه وضبط الكتاب بصيانته عنده الى وقت الاداء

"retentiveness signifies the retaining of what has been heard, and its being held fast from escaping or growing faint, so that it can be called up; it consists of two parts: retentiveness by mind, and retentiveness by book; retentiveness by mind comes of committing to heart and keeping in memory, and retentiveness by book results from preserving it without change against the time for reciting it."

These qualifications of the reporter are more exactly defined by the following specifications of causes by which they are vitiated, drawn from H. First, as to integrity, we read :‡

* page 5.

† fol. 2, rect.

‡ fol. 2, rect. and vers.

اما العدالة فوجوه الطعن المتعلقة بها خمس الاول بالكذب والثاني باتهامه بالكذب والثالث بالفسق والرابع بالجهالة والخامس بالبدعة والمراد بكذب الراوى انه ثبت كذبه في الحديث النبوى ... أما باقرار الواقع او بغير ذلك من القرائين وحديث الطعن بالكذب يسمى موضعا ومن ثبت عنه تبعد الكذب في الحديث وان كان وقوعه في العبرة وان تاب من ذلك لم يقبل حديثه ابدا بخلاف شاهد الزور اذا تاب فلمراد بالحديث الموضع في اصطلاح الحدثيين هذا لانه ثبت كذبه وعلم ذلك في هذا الحديث بخصوصه والمسيلة ظنية والحكم بالوضع والاقتراء بحكم الظن الغالب وليس الى القطع واليقين بذلك سبب فان الكذب قد يصدق وبهذا يندفع ما قيل في معرفة الوضع باقرار الواقع انه يجوز ان يكون كاذبا في هذا الاقرار فإنه يعرف صدقه بغالب الظن ولو ذلك لما ساع قتل المفتر ولا رجم المعترض بالزنا فافهم واما اتهام الراوى بالكذب فبان يكون مشهورا بالكذب ومحروفا به في كلام الناس ولم يثبت كذبه في الحديث النبوى وفي حكمه رواية ما يخالف قواعد معلومة ضرورية في الشعير كذا قيل ويسمى هذا القسم متروكا كما يقال حديثه متروك وفلان متروك للحديث وهذا الرجل ان تاب وتحت توبيته وظهرت امارات الصدق منه جاز سماح للحديث والذي يقع منه احيانا نادرا في كلامه غير الحديث النبوى فذلك غير مؤثر في تسمية حديثه بالموضوع والمتروك وان كانت معصية واما الفسق فلمراد به الفسق في العمل دون الاعتقاد فان ذلك داخل في البدعة واكثر ما يستعمل البدعة في الاعتقاد والكذب وان كان داخلا في الفسق لكنهم عدوه اصلا على حدة لكون الطعن به اشد واغلظ واما جهالة الراوى فإنه ايضا سبب للطعن في الحديث لانه لما يعرف اسمه وذاته لم يعرف حانته وانه ثقة او غير ثقة كما يقول حدثني رجل او اخبرني شيخ ويسمى هذا مبهم وحديث المبهم غير مقبول الا ان يكون صحابيا لأنهم عدوين وان جاء المبهم بلفظ التعديل كما يقول اخبارني عدل او حدثني ثقة ففيه اختلاف والاصح انه لا يقبل لانه يجوز ان يكون عدلا في اعتقاده لا في نفس الامر وان قال ذلك امام حاذق قبل واما البدعة فلمراد بها اعتقاد امر محدث على خلاف ما عرف في الدين وما جاء من رسول الله ... واصحابه بنوع شبهة وتناوليل لا بطريق حجود وانكار فان ذلك كفر وحديث المبتدع مردود عند الى به وعند البعض ان كان متصفا بصدق اللهجة وصيانته اللسان قبل وقال بعضهم ان كان منكرا لامر متواتر في الشرع وقد علم بالضرورة كونه من الدين فهو

مردود وان لم يكون بهذه الصفة يقبل وان كفرا المخالفون مع وجود ضبط وورع وتقوى واحتياط وصيانته والمحترار انه ان كان داعيا الى بدعنته ومزوجا له رد وان لم يكن كذلك قبل الا ان يروي شيئا يقوى به بدعنته فهو مردود قطعا وبالجملة الاية مختلفون في اخذ الحديث من اهل البذع والاهواء وارباب المذاهب الرايغة وقال صاحب جامع الاصول اخذ جماعة من اية الحديث من فرقة للوارج والمتسبين الى القدر والشيع والرفس وسائر اصحاب البذع والاهواء وقد احتنط جماعة اخرون وتورعوا من اخذ الحديث من هذه الفرق ولكن منهم نيات انتهى ولا شك ان اخذ للحديث من هذه الفرق يكون بعد التحرى والاستقصواب ومع ذلك الاحتياط في عدم الاخذ لانه قد ثبت ان هؤلاء الفرق كانوا يصنعون الاحاديث لترويج مذاهبهم وكانوا يقررون به بعد التنوية والرجوع والله اعلم

“As to integrity, there are five ways in which it is vitiated (وجوه) (الطعن) : 1. by falsehood ; 2. by suspicion of falsehood ; 3. by impiety ; 4. by want of information ; 5. by heresy.

“By falsehood on the part of the reporter (كذب الرواى) is meant his setting up some false statement of his as part of the tradition of the Prophet . . . either by affirmation as a deponent, or by some other such means ; and the tradition of one dishonored by falsehood is called suppositious (موضوع). Whoever is proved to have purposely set up falsehood as part of tradition, although only once in his life, and notwithstanding repentance, is dishonored as a reporter of received tradition—wherein there is a difference between him and the repentant false witness. Such, then, is the signification of suppositious tradition, in the technical language of traditionists ; for it consists in this, that one is known to have set up some falsehood of his, definitely, as part of the tradition of the Prophet. In case it is a question of opinion, and one is judged to have fabricated and falsified by the judgment of preponderating opinion, since that affords no means of decision and certainty, the falsifier is esteemed truthful. This is at variance with what is commonly said respecting knowledge derived from deposition, with the affirmation of a deponent, namely, that one may be false in such affirmation, and that preponderating opinion determines whether one is truthful ; and, if such were not the principle [as regards testimony in court], how could it be lawful to put to death a man who affirms that he has committed murder, and not so to stone him who confesses fornication ? Therefore, consider.

“With regard to suspicion of falsehood in the reporter (اتهام الرواى) بالكذب), in case one is notorious for falsehood, and generally remarked upon for it (though he may not have actually set up any falsehood of his as part of the tradition of the Prophet), and there is derived from him the report of something which is at variance with the known and essential fundamental principles of law—the same is to be said as before [that

tradition from him is not to be received] ; and this subdivision is called let-alone tradition (متروك), as when one says: 'a tradition let alone,' and 'Such a one's tradition is let alone.' If the man repents, and signs of his truthfulness appear, it is allowable to hear tradition from him.

"Occasional and infrequent falsehood in what one says, irrespective of the tradition of the Prophet, although it is a thing to be abhorred, does not operate to give the name of 'supposititious' or 'let-alone' to his tradition.

"By impiety (الفسق) is meant impiety in conduct, not that which respects belief; for the latter has to do with heresy, and the term heresy is most commonly applied to a corrupt faith; and, although falsehood enters into impiety, yet people count that as a separate principle, because its influence in dishonoring integrity is most potent and overpowering.

"Again, want of information respecting a reporter (جهالة المرادي) causes integrity to be vitiated, in the case of tradition, because, when one's name and personality are unknown, it is not ascertained what sort of a man he was, whether he was a reliable authority, or the contrary; as, for example, when it is said: 'a certain guarantee taught me as a tradition so and so,' or 'I learnt from a certain teacher so and so as a tradition.' Such a reporter is called doubtful (مجهوم), and the tradition of a doubtful person is not to be received, unless he was a witness of the Prophet (صحابي)—for all witnesses had integrity. As to the case of a doubtful reporter's declaring the integrity of his authority in express terms—for instance, when one says: 'I learnt from a person of integrity so and so as a tradition,' or 'A reliable authority taught me as a tradition so and so,' there is difference of opinion—the soundest judgment is against receiving the tradition, because there may be the belief of integrity without its reality. If, however, such language is used by an eminent teacher possessed of nice discernment, the tradition is received.

"Heresy (ابن دعوة) is the holding to some novelty of opinion, at variance with what is recognized as a part of religion, and has come down from the Prophet of God . . . and his Companions, by virtue of some figurative and allegorical interpretation, not in the way of absolute denial and repudiation—which is a species of infidelity; and the tradition of a heretic is most generally rejected. Some, indeed, receive it, if characterized by truthfulness of language and guarded phraseology. Others say that, if it contradicts something often repeated in the law, and which is known to be a necessary part of religion, it is to be rejected, and, if it has not this character, that it is to be received, however discredited by opposers, provided it be reported with retentiveness, in a religious spirit, in the way of confirmation of received doctrine, and in circumspect and guarded language. It is best to reject it, in case it leans towards a heresy of the reporter, and is to him a connecting link of argument, and otherwise to receive it; yet, if one reports something whereby his heresy is in fact strengthened, it is decisively to be rejected.

"To speak more generally, eminent teachers differ as to receiving the tradition of innovating and loose sects, and of leaders in heterodox

ways of thinking. Says the author of the *Jāmi' al-'Uṣūl* :* 'A number of eminent teachers of tradition have taken from the Khawārij, and from those whose distinctive names refer to their doctrine of free will (القدر), their separation (الشیع), and their alienation (الرخص), as well as from all innovating and lax parties; while a number of others have been circumspect, and have warned against taking tradition from these parties. All have their motives.' Doubtless, tradition is taken from these parties deliberately and approvingly; yet should the practice be avoided, because it is established as a fact that these parties were once in the habit of fabricating traditions in order to give currency to their doctrines—which, indeed, used to be affirmed by themselves, after repentance and return to orthodoxy—God knows.'

Next, as to retentiveness, we read as follows:†

واما وجوه الطعن المتعلقة بالصبط فهى ايضا خمسة احدها فرط الغفلة وثانيها كثرة الغلط وثالثها مخالفة الثقات ورابعها الوهم وخامسها سوء الحفظ اما فرط الغفلة وكثرة الغلط فتقابران فالغفلة في اسماع وتحمل الحديث والغلط في الاسماع والاداء ومخالفة الثقات في الاسناد او المتن تكون على اصحاب متعددة تكون مومية للشذوذ وجعلها من وجوه الطعن المتعلقة بالصبط من جهة ان الباعث على مخالفة الثقات اما هو عدم الصبط والحفظ وعدم الصيانة عن التغيير والتبدل والطعن من جهة الوهم والنسيان اللذين اخطأ بهما وروى على سبيل التوهم ان حصل الاطلاع على ذلك بقولين دالة على وجوه علل واسباب قادحة كان الحديث معللا وهذا اغمض علوم الحديث وادقها ولا يقوم به الا من رزق فهمها وحفظها واسعا ومعرفة تامة بمراتب الرواية واحوال الاسانيد والمتون كالمتقدمين من ارباب هذا الفن الى انتهاى الدارقطنى ويقال لم يات بعده مثله في هذا الامر والله اعلم واما سوء الحفظ فقالوا ان المراد به ان لا يكون اصابته اغلب على خطأه وحفظه واتفاقه اكثر من سهوه ونسيانه يعني ان كان خطأه ونسيانه اغلب او ساويها لصوابه واتفاقه كان داخلا في سوء الحفظ فالمعتمد عليه صوابه واتفاقه وكثرتهم وسوء الحفظ ان كان لازم حاله في جميع الاوقات ومدة عمره لا يعتبر بحديثه وعند بعض المحدثين هذا ايضا داخل في الشاذ وان طرق سوء الحفظ لعارض مثل اختلال في المخاطة بسبب كبير سند او ذهاب بصرة او فوات كتبه وهذا يسمى مختلطنا فما روى قبل

* A critical compend of the six great collections of Muslim tradition, with explanations of unusual terms, by 'Ibn 'Athir 'aj-Jazari, who died A. H. 606, on the basis of an earlier work of the same sort by Razin 'al-'Abdar; see Hāfi Khalfah's *Lex.*, iii. 33, and ii. 501.

† *foll. 2, vers., and 3, rect.*

الاختلاط والاختلال متميزة عما رواه بعد هذا الحال قبل وإن لم يتميّز توقف
وان اشتبه فكذلك وان وجد لهذا القسم متابعات وشواهد ترقى من مرتبة
الرد الى القبول والرخان وهذا حكم احاديث المستور والمدلس والمرسل

“Again, there are five ways in which retentiveness is vitiated: 1. by excess of carelessness; 2. by great blundering; 3. by disagreement with reliable authorities; 4. by oversight; 5. by badness of memory.

“Excess of carelessness (فَرَطُ الْغَلَطَ) and great blundering (كثرة الغلط) are allied to one another, for carelessness is predicated of the oral statement (الإسْمَاعُ) of tradition, as well as of the taking of it up; while blundering has respect to the oral statement and the recitation (الآدَاءُ) of it.

“Disagreement with reliable authorities (مخالفة النّفّات), which respects either the allegation of authority or the text, and has various phases, promotes the violation of analogy (الشَّذْوُنُ) in tradition; and the reason for its being set down as one of the ways in which retentiveness is vitiated, is that disagreement with reliable authorities arises only from the want of retentiveness and memory, together with lack of care to avoid changes and substitutions.

“With respect to that vitiation of retentiveness which is owing to the oversight (اللَّوْهِمَ) and neglect (النَّسِيَانُ) whereby one commits error and reports fancifully, if the publication of a tradition in such fanciful form is accompanied with evidences of pretexts, or of originating grounds which impair its force, the tradition becomes simulated (مُعَلَّلٌ). Here is the most obscure and subtle part of the science of tradition, and no one masters it who is not possessed of intelligence and an ample memory, as well as a perfect knowledge of the several grades of reporters, and of the circumstances affecting the character of allegations of authority and texts, like the great masters of the science in former times, down to ‘ad-Dârakutnî—since whose day, it is said, no one similarly proficient on this subject has appeared—God knows.

“As for badness of memory (سوء الْحَفْظِ), people say that by this is meant that one is not right more frequently than he goes astray, and that he does not remember and exactly know oftener than he lets slip and forgets: that is to say, if he is more habitually wrong and forgetful than right and exact, or equally so, that goes to constitute badness of memory; so that a reporter, to be relied upon, must be correct and exact in his knowledge, and possess these qualities in large measure. The tradition of one whose badness of memory is a constant circumstance of his condition, having pertained to him through his whole life, has no weight; and, in the opinion of some traditionists, such badness of memory enters into the idea of separate tradition (الشاذ). If badness of memory is due to some accidental circumstance, like diminution of the recollective faculty on account of one’s great age, or the failure of one’s sight, or the loss of one’s books, this constitutes what is called a confused tradition (الختلط); but what one reported before his tradition became confused, and his memory was impaired, being distinguished

from that reported subsequently, is to be received: without this discrimination, there is no reaching back to the Prophet by the report of one whose memory has thus failed him; so too, in case the distinction cannot be clearly made out. If there exist imitative (متتابعات), or witnessing (شواهد), traditions which answer to that which is confused, it is thereby elevated from the grade of rejection to that of acceptance and prevalence; as is the case, also, with the tradition of a reporter who is of questionable character (المُسْتَوْر), or who disguises (المُدَلِّس), or who gives out tradition loosely (المُرْسَل).”

The disqualifying defects in a reporter, which render him untrustworthy, are also summarily presented by J. in the following passage:*

فِي الْجُرْحِ لَا يَقْبِلُ رَوْيَةً مِنْ عَرْفٍ بِالنَّأْتَاهُلِ فِي السَّمَاعِ وَالْأَسْمَاعِ بِالنَّوْمِ وَالْأَشْتَغَالِ
أَوْ مِنْ بَحْدَتِ لَا مِنْ أَصْلِ مَصْحَحٍ أَوْ يَكْثُرُ سَهْوَهُ إِذَا بَحْدَتِ مِنْ أَصْلِ مَصْحَحٍ
أَوْ كَثُرَتِ الشَّوَّادُ وَالْمَنَاكِيرُ فِي حَدِيثِهِ وَمِنْ غَلْطٍ فِي حَدِيثِهِ فَبَيْنَ لَهُ الْغَلْطُ
فَأَصْرَرَ وَلَمْ يَرْجِعْ قَبْلَ يَسْقُطْ عَدَالَتَهُ قَالَ أَبْنُ الصَّلَاحِ هَذَا إِذَا كَانَ عَلَى وَجْهِهِ
الْعَنَادُ وَمَا إِذَا كَانَ عَلَى وَجْهِ التَّنَقِيرِ فِي الْبَحْثِ

“Respecting *confutation* (الْجُرْح). The report of one who is known to have been in the habit of falling asleep, or of being absent-minded, in the hearing read to him, or in the oral statement, of tradition, is not to be received; nor that of one who teaches tradition from an uncorrected copy, or who is very careless when he teaches from a copy which has been corrected, or who reports many separate (الشَّوَّاد), or undetermined (الْمَنَاكِير) traditions: and whoever blunders in his tradition, and, after his blundering has been made manifest to him, holds on to it and does not abandon it, is said to have lost his integrity, provided, as *Ibn 'as-Salāh* says, he does so in the way of opposition, or of captiousness in discussion”—

to which the author adds the important remark that reliability in a reporter was not, in his time, estimated strictly according to the specified conditions of it, as follows:†

فَلَا تُذَبِّيلُ أَعْرَضُ النَّاسِ فِي هَذِهِ الْأَعْصَارِ عَنْ مَجْمُوعِ الشُّرُوطِ الْمُذَكُورَةِ
وَأَكْتَفُوا مِنْ عَدَالَةِ الرَّاوِي بَانِ يَكُونُ مُسْتَوْرًا وَمِنْ ضَبْطِهِ بِوُجُودِ سَمَاعِهِ
مَتَبَتَّا بِخَطْطٍ مُوْتَوْقَ بِهِ وَرَوَايَتِهِ مِنْ أَصْلِ مَوْاْفَقٍ لَاَصْلٍ شَيْخَهُ وَذَلِكُ لَأَنَّ
الْحَدِيثَ الصَّحِيْحَ وَالْمُحْسَنَ وَغَيْرَهَا قَدْ جَمِعَتْ فِي كِتَابِ الْإِيْمَانِ فَلَا يَذَهِبُ
شَيْبِيْهُ مِنْهُمْ وَالْقَصْدُ بِالْأَسْمَاعِ بِقَاءُ السَّلْسَلَةِ فِي الْأَسْنَادِ الْمَخْصُوصَ

بِهَذِهِ الْأَمْمَةِ

"But, to cut the matter short, men in these times treat with slight all the specified conditions [of reliability], and are satisfied, as regards a reporter's integrity, with his being one whose integrity is neither proved nor disproved (مستور); and, as regards his retentiveness, with the fact that what he hears read to him as a teacher (مساعده) is set down in a handwriting which can be depended upon, and that his report is from an autograph corresponding to the autograph of his master—and this because the books of the eminent teachers include not only sound tradition, but also the fair, and that which is neither sound nor fair, so that all tradition whatever is gathered up; besides that the object of the teacher's hearing tradition read to him is only to perpetuate the chain of connection in an allegation of authority which has currency in a particular school."

In contrast with the laxness indicated in this last paragraph, there is even a religious importance attached to the character of the authorities for a tradition, in the following from M., which thus bears the impress of much earlier times:*

باب غى ان الاسناد من الدين

وحدثنا حسن بن الربيع نا حماد بن زيد عن أبيوب وهشام عن محمد ح
وحدثنا فضيل عن هشام قال وحدثنا مخلد بن حسين عن هشام عن
محمد بن سيرين قال إن هذا العلم دين فانظروا عمن تأخذون دينكم
حدثنا أبو جعفر محمد بن الصباح نا اسماعيل بن زكريا عى عاصم الاحول
عن ابن سيرين قال لم يكونوا يسألون عن الاسناد فلما وقعت الفتنة قالوا
سو لنا رجالكم فينظر إلى أهل السنة فيؤخذ حديثهم وبينظر إلى أهل
البدع فلا يؤخذ حديثهم حدثنا اسحاق بن ابراهيم الحنظلي أنا عيسى
وهو ابن يونس ثنا الأوزاعي عن سليمان بن موسى قال نقيت طوسا فقللت
حدثني فلان كبيت وكبيت قال أن كان مليا فخذ عنه وحدثنا عبد الله بن
عبد الرحمن الدارمي أنا مروان يعني ابن محمد الدمشقى أنا سعيد بن
عبد العزيز عن سليمان بن موسى قال قلت لطوسا أن فلانا حدثني بهذا
وكذا فقال أن كان صاحبك مليا فخذ عنه حدثنا نصر بن على الجهمي
نا الاصمعي عن ابن أبي الزناد عن أبيه قال ادركنا بالمدينة مائة كلام مأمون
ما يؤخذ عنهم الحديث يقال ليس من أهله حدثنا محمد بن أبي عمر المكي
نا سفيان وحدثني أبو بكر بن خلاد الباعلى واللفظ له قال سمعت سفيان
بن عبيدة عن مسعود قال سمعت سعد بن ابراهيم يقول لا يحدث عن رسول
الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الا الثقات وحدثني محمد بن عبد الله بن قهزان من

* pages 10, 11.

أهل مرو قال سمعت عبدان ابن عثيّان يقول سمعت عبد الله بن المبارك يقول
الاسناد من الدين ولو لا الاسناد لقال من شاء ما شاء وحدثني محمد بن
عبد الله حدثني العباس ابن أبي رزمة قال سمعت عبد الله يقول بيننا
وبين القوم القوائم يعني الاسناد وقال محمد سمعت أبا إسحاق إبراهيم بن
عيسى الطالقاني قال قلت لعبد الله بن المبارك يا أبا عبد الرحمن للحديث
الذى جاء أبا من البر بعد البر ان تصلى لابويك مع صلوتك وتصوم لهما
مع صوموك قال فقلت له عبد الله يا أبا إسحاق عمن هذا قال قلت له هذا من
حديث شهاب بن خراش قال ثقة عمن قال قلت وعن الحجاج بن دينار
قال ثقة عمن قال قلت قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال يا أبا إسحاق
ان بين الحجاج بن دينار وبين النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مفاوز تنتقطع فيها
اعناق المطى ولكن ليس فى الصدقة اختلاف

“Chapter on the Allegation of Authority, as a Matter of Religion.

“Hasan Bin ‘ar-Rabi’ tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by Hammâd Bin Zaid, on the authority of ‘Aiyûb and Hishâm, on the authority of Muhammad, as follows’—and Fudhail tells us for a tradition, on the authority of a saying of Hishâm, as follows—and Makâd Bin Husain tells us for a tradition, on the authority of Hishâm, on the authority of a saying of Muhammâd Bin Sirin: “This science is a religion: beware, then, on whose authority ye take up your religion.”’

“Abû-Jâ’far Muhammâd Bin ‘as-Sabbâh tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by ‘Ismâ’îl Bin Zâkariyâ, on the authority of ‘Âsim ‘al-‘Âhwal, on the authority of a saying of Ibn Sirin: “People were not accustomed to ask about the support; but after there came to be dissension among them, some said: ‘Name to us your guarantees (رجال),’ and so those who held to the orthodox traditional law were respected, and their tradition was taken up, while care was taken not to take up the tradition of heretics.”’.

“Ishâk Bin ‘Ibrâhîm ‘al-Hanzâlî tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by ‘Isâ, the son of Yûnus, saying: “Al-‘Auzâ’î tells us for a tradition, on the authority of a saying of Sulaimân Bin Mûsa: ‘I met Tâ’us, and said: “Such an one tells me for a tradition so and so;” said he: “If he is diligent to perform all the duties of religion, take up tradition on his authority.”’

“‘Abdallah Bin ‘Abd ‘ar-Rahmân ‘ad-Dârimî tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by Marwân’—he means ‘Ibn Muhammad ‘ad Dimashkî’—saying: “We are informed by Sa’îd Bin ‘Abd ‘al-‘Azîz, on the authority of a saying of Sulaimân Bin Mûsa: ‘I said to Tâ’us: “Such an one tells me for a tradition so and so;” said he: “If thy teacher is diligent to perform all the duties of religion, take up tradition on his authority.”’

“Nasr Bin ‘Alî ‘aj-Juhdhâmî tells us for a tradition, saying: ‘We are informed by ‘al-‘Aşmâ’î, on the authority of ‘Ibn ‘Abu-z-Zinâd, on the

authority of a saying of his father: "I saw at Madinah a hundred persons, all believers, on whose authority tradition was not taken up—of whom it was said that they were not the people to transmit tradition."

"Muhammad Bin 'Abū'Umar 'al-Makkī tells us for a tradition, saying: 'We are informed by Sufyān, as follows—and 'Abū-Bakr Bin Khalīl 'al-Bāhilī tells us for a tradition, in his own words, saying: 'I heard Sufyān Bin 'Uyainah say on the authority of Mi'sar: 'I heard Sa'ad Bin Ibrāhīm say: "Only reliable authorities give out tradition which has the authority of the Messenger of God . . . ?'"

"Muhammad Bin 'Abdallāh Bin Kuhzādī, an inhabitant of Marv, tells us for a tradition, saying: 'I heard 'Abdallāh Bin 'al-Mubārak say: "The allegation of authority is a matter of religion; and, were it not for this support, whoever pleased would say whatever he pleased."

"Muhammad Bin 'Abdallāh tells us for a tradition, saying: 'It is told to me for a tradition by 'al-Abbās 'Ibn 'Abū-Rizmāh, saying: "I heard 'Abdallāh say: 'Between us and our enemies there are the standards—meaning the allegation of authority."

"Muhammad also says: 'I heard 'Abū-'Ishāk Ibrāhīm Bin 'Isā 'at-Tālakānī say: "I said to 'Abdallāh Bin 'al-Mubārak: 'O 'Abū 'Abd 'ar-Rahmān, what of the tradition handed down to us in the words: "It ever pertains to piety that thou shouldst pray for thy parents in thy prayer, and fast for them in thy fasting"?' Whereupon 'Abdallāh said to him: "O 'Abū-'Ishāk, on whose authority is this?" "to which," said he, "I replied: 'This is a tradition of Shihāb Bin Khirāsh'; said 'Abdallāh: 'A reliable authority—on whose authority does he give it?' to which I replied: 'It is on the authority of 'al-Hajjāj Bin Dīnār,' said 'Abdallāh: 'A reliable authority—on whose authority does he give it?' to which I replied: 'That of the Messenger of God . . . ;' said 'Abdallāh: 'O 'Abū-'Ishāk, between 'al-Hajjāj Bin Dīnār and the Prophet . . . there are deserts in which the beast's supply of water fails him,'* though no one disputes the truthfulness of that reporter.'"

This passage is followed, in Muslim's introduction, by a chapter of traditions disproving the authority of certain individual reporters. But even so early a writer as Muslim notices a laxness in the application of the principle of dependence upon reliable authorities alone, closing that chapter as follows:†

قال أبو الحسين مسلم بن الحجاج وشبه ما ذكرنا من كلام أهل العلم في مذهب رواة الحديث وآخبارهم عن معايبهم كثير يطول الكتاب بذلك على استقصايه وفيما ذكرنا كفاية لمن تفهم وعقل مذهب القوم فيما قالوا من ذلك وبينوا وإنما الزموا أنفسهم الكشف عن معايب رواة الحديث ونقايل الآخبار واقنعوا بذلك حين سبوا لما فيه من عظيم الخطأ أن الأخبار في أمر الدين إنما تاتي بتحليل أو تحرير أو أمر أو نهي أو ترغيب أو ترهيب

* i. e. The break in the connection of the tradition is too wide for safe transmission.

† page 20.

فإذا كان الرادى لها ليس بعدن للصدق والأمانة ثم أقدم على الرواية عنه من قد عرفه ولم يبين ما فيه لغبته من جهل معرفته كان أثناً بفعله ذلك غاشياً لعوام المسلمين أذ لا يؤمن على بعض من سمع تلك الاخبار أن يستعملها أو يستعمل بعضها وعليها أو أكثرها أكذيب لا أصل لها مع أن الاخبار الصحاح من روایة الثقات وأهل القناعة أكثر من أن يضطرب إلى نقل من ليس بتقة ولا مقتنع ولا أحسب كثيراً من يخرج من الناس على ما وضفنا من هذه الأحاديث الضعاف والأسانيد الجهولة ويعتقد بروايتها بعد معرفته بما فيها من الوهن والضعف إلا أن الذي يحمله على روايتها والاعتداد بها أرادة التكثير عند العوام ولأن يقال ما أكثر ما جمع فلان من الحديث وألّف من العدد ومن ذهب في العلم هذا المذهب وسلك هذا الطريق فلا نصيبي له فيه وكان بلن يسمى جاعلاً أوّل من أن ينسب إلى علم

“Says 'Abu-l-Husain Muslim Bin 'al-Hajjâj : Of remarks by traditionists respecting suspicious reporters of tradition, and of traditional statements by them with regard to the faults of such reporters, similar to those which we have cited, there are many, which it would take long to mention, in writing, even briefly. But what we have given is sufficient for one who is intelligent, and understands, from what people have said and plainly declared, their general way of thinking.

“Yet traditionists themselves do not consider it obligatory to expose the faults of reporters of tradition, and transmitters of traditional statements, and to pronounce decisions accordingly, except when they are inquired of in respect to something involving great risk. In case traditional statements refer to a matter of religion, whatever bearing they have is to convey permission or disapprobation, command or prohibition, incitement or restraint; so that, if their reporter is not a man of fixed veracity and trustworthiness, and if objection has been made to reporting on his authority, by some one acquainted with him, and if others, having no knowledge respecting him, are not informed of the state of the case, by one's thus acting deceptively the generality of Muslims become involved in guilt—inasmuch as it is safe for no one who hears those traditional statements to use them, or any of them, because, perhaps, they or most of them are false and groundless; besides that sound traditional statements, coming from reliable reporters and persons possessed of a tranquil assurance of mind, are too numerous that there should be need of what is transmitted by reporters who are unreliable, or devoid of assurance. For myself, I think not much of those men who lay stress upon such weak traditions, and ignored supports, as we have described, and make account of reporting them, after they know their infirmity and weakness, for the mere reason that they are impelled to report them, and to make account of them, by the wish to appear to common people as multipliers of tradition, and for the sake of its being said: ‘How

many traditions has such an one collected !" and 'How by the thousand does such a one count traditions !' Whoever proceeds on such grounds in the science, and acts thus, has no part in it, and is to be called ignorant rather than learned."

We may next consider certain stipulations respecting the modes of communicating tradition, by which additional guards to its purity are provided in the system which we aim to develop. This will throw light upon some expressions in the extracts already given, which may not have been fully understood by the reader, and naturally precedes the consideration of what relates to tradition itself. Here J. will be our first authority, whose third chapter reads thus:*

في تحمل الحديث

يصح التحمل قبل الاسلام وكذا قبل البلوغ فان الحسن والحسين وابن عباس وابن الزبير تحملوا قبل البلوغ ولم ينزل بسم عون الصبيان واختلف فى الزمن الذى يصح فيه السماع من الصبي قبيل خمس سنين وقبيل يعتبر كل صغير حاله اذا فهم الخطاب ورد اليه سماعه وان كان دون خمس والا لم يصح ولتحمل الحديث طرق الاول السماع من لفظ الشیخ الثنائى القراءة عليه الثالث الاجازة ولها انواع اجازة معين معين كاجزتك كتاب البخارى او اجزت فلانا جميع ما استند عليه فيرسى واجازة معين فى غير معين كاجزتك مسموعاتى او مروياتى واجازة العموم كاجزت المسلمين او لمن ادرك زمانى والصحيح جواز الرواية بهذه الاقسام واجازة المعدوم كاجزت من بولد لفلان والصحيح المنع ولو قال لفلان ومن بولد له اولك ولعقبك جاز كالوقف والاجازة للتحفل الذى لم يتميز صحيحة لأنها اباحت للرواية والاباحة تصبح للعاقل وغيره واجازة المجاز كاجزت لك ما اجبت لى ويستحب الاجازة اذا كان المجبى والجاز له من اهل العلم لأنها توسع يحتاج اليه اهل العلم وينبغى للمجبر بالكتابة ان يتلفظ بها فان انتصر على الكتابة صاحت الرابع المناولة واعلما ما يقرن بالاجازة وذلك بان يدفع اليه اصل سماعه او فرعا مقابلا به ويقول هذا سماعى او روايتى عن فلان اجزت لك روايتك ثم يبقيه في يده تهليكا او الى ان ينسخه ومنها ان يتناول الطالب الشیخ سماعه فيتأمله وهو عارف متيقظ ثم بناوله الطالب

ويقول هو حديثى او سماعى فارو عنى وبسمى هذا عرض المتناوله ولها اقسام اخر الخامس المكتسبة وهي ان يكتب مسموعه لغائب او حاضر بخطه او ياذن بكتبه له وهي اما مقتننة بالاجازة كان يكتب اجرت لك او مجردة عنها والصحيحة جواز الرواية على التقديم بين السادس الاعلام وهو ان يعلم الشیخ الطالب ان هذا الكتاب روايته من غير ان يقول اروه عنی والاصح انه لا يجوز روايته لاحتمال ان يكون الشیخ قد عرف فيه خللا فلا ياذن فيه السابع الوجادة من وجد بجد مولد وهو ان يقف على كتاب بخط شیخ فيه احادیث ليس له رواية عما فيها فله ان يقول وجدت او قرأت بخط فلان او في كتاب فلان بخطه حدثنا فلان ويسوق باقى الاسناد والمتى وقد استمر عليه العمل قدیماً وحديثنا وهو من باب المرسل فيه شوب من الانصار واعلم ان قوماً شددوا فقلوا لا حجة الا فيما رواه حفظاً وقيل يجوز من كتابه الا اذا خرج من يده وتساهل اخرون وقالوا يجوز الرواية من نسخ غير مقابلة باصولها والحق ان اقام في التحتمل والضبط والمقابلة بما تقدم جازت الرواية عنه وكذلك ان غاب عنه الكتاب اذا كان الغالب سلامته من تغيير ولا سيما اذا كان من لا يخفى عليه تغيير غالباً

“On the Taking up (التحمّل) of Tradition.

“Tradition may properly be taken up before a profession of islamism, and likewise before full age; for 'al-Hasan, 'al-Husain, 'Ibn 'Abbas, and 'Ibn Zubair took up tradition before they had reached maturity, and youths have ever been admitted to the hearing of tradition; though there is difference of opinion as to the exact time when a youth may properly become a hearer—some saying that this may be at five years of age, and some, that the case of each young person is to be separately considered, and that, if he understands what is addressed to him, and how to answer, they approve of his becoming a hearer of tradition, although he be less than five years old, and, otherwise, that he can not properly be a hearer.

“There are several ways of taking up tradition: 1. by hearing the oral communication of a master (السماع من لفظ الشیخ); 2. by reading to him (القراءة عليه); 3. by license—of which there are several kinds: [a] license of a particular individual for something specific, as: ‘I license thee for the book of 'al-Bukhārī’ or ‘I license such an one for all that is in my table of contents;’ [b] license of a particular individual in respect to something not specified, as: ‘I license thee as to whatever I hear read to me,’ or ‘.... as to whatever is reported by me;’ [c] license of people in general, as: ‘I license Muslims,’ or ‘....

all my cotemporaries?—and in these forms tradition is properly allowed to be reported; [d] license of a person who does not exist, as: 'I license whoever may be born to such a one'—which ought not to be admitted, though, if one says: '.... such a one and whoever may be born to him,' or '.... thee and thy posterity,' it is admissible, on the same principle as a permanent charitable bequest (**الوقف**); [e] license of a little child who is not marked by any maturity of mind; for maturity of mind constitutes a free permission to report, and the free permission of reporting holds good in respect to one who has not attained to years of intelligence as well as to one who has; [f] license as to what has been licensed, as: 'I license thee as to whatever has been licensed to me.' it is preferable, in the case of license, that both he who licenses and he who is licensed should be conversant with the science of tradition, because there is a looseness about this form of transmission, which requires to be controlled by persons so instructed: one who licenses by a writing does well to say off what he writes; yet, if he limits himself to the writing, that holds good; 4. by presentation (**المناولة**)—of which the highest sort [a] is that accompanied with license, which consists in the master's handing to one either an autograph, or a copy therewith collated, of what he hears read to him, and saying: 'This is what I hear read' (or, 'my report'), 'on the authority of such a one, I license to thee the reporting of it,' after which he leaves it in his hands, for his own, or until he can copy it; another sort of presentation [b] consists in the inquirer's handing to the master that which he hears read to him, which the latter then dwells upon with discrimination and attention, and afterwards presents to the inquirer, saying: 'It is my tradition' (or, 'what I hear read'), 'so report on my authority'—this is called reverse presentation (**عرض المناولة**): and there are also other subdivisions; 5. by written communication (**المكتبة**), which consists in the master's writing in his own hand, or permitting to be written, that which he hears read to him, expressly for one who is absent, or for one who is present; and is either accompanied with license, as, for example, when one writes: 'I license thee,' or without this form—to report in either mode is admissible and proper; 6. by certification (**الاعلام**), which consists in the master's making known to the inquirer that a certain book is his report of tradition, without saying: 'Report it on my authority'—which is not an admissible reporting of it, according to the most proper view, since there is a possibility that the master may have recognized in the inquirer some gravity, in consequence of which he does not authorize him in respect to it; 7. by discovery (**الوجادة**)—a term of recent origin, from **جَدَ وَجَدَ**—which consists in one's carefully reading some book in the handwriting of a master, which contains traditions, without receiving any report of it other than is comprised in the traditions themselves, and then saying: 'I have found' (or, 'I have read') 'in the handwriting of such an one' (or, 'in a book of such an one, in his handwriting') 'as follows: "we learn from such an one as tradition so and so" '—leaving the rest of the allegation of authority, and the text, at loose ends—a practice which has held its ground both in ancient and modern times, and

constitutes a sort of loosened tradition (المرسل), with something in it of continuousness (الاتصال).

“Some persons, be it known, are strict, and say that no legal proof can be made out from tradition not reported by memory; while others say that reporting by one’s book is allowable, so long as one has it under his control. Others again are so lax as to say that one may report from copies not collated with their originals. The truth is that one becomes a reliable authority for tradition by the continued habit of taking it up, persevering effort at retention, and constant application to collating with an earlier text; and this, even if one’s book is not controlled, since the probability is that it is not varied from, especially if the reporter be one who would be likely to know of any alteration of it.”

The books of tradition show us a distinction of form which is supposed to refer to the mode of receiving traditional statements, in their use of the terms حَدَثَ and أَخْبَرَ, the former being appropriated, as is believed, to the case of a teacher’s making an oral communication, and the latter to that of the pupil’s reading to him. On this distinctive use of the two terms we quote the following from the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms . . .**:

وَمِنْهُمْ مَنْ رَأَى التَّفْرِقَ بَيْنَ الصِّبْغِ بَحْسَبِ افْتَرَاقِ التَّحْمِلِ فِيْخَصُّونَ التَّحْدِيدَ بِمَا تَلْفَظُ بِهِ الشَّيْخُ وَالْأَخْبَارُ بِمَا يَقْرَأُ عَلَيْهِ وَهُذَا مَذْهَبُ أَبْنِ جَرِيجِ وَالْأَوزَاعِيِّ وَالشَّافِعِيِّ وَابْنِ وَهَبِّ وَجَمِيعُ أَهْلِ الْمَشْرُقِ ثُمَّ احْدَثَ أَتَّبَاعُهُمْ تَفْصِيلًا مُخْرِجًا فَنِ سَمْ وَحْدَهُ مِنْ لَفْظِ الشَّيْخِ اغْرَدَ فَقَالَ حَدَّشْنِي وَمِنْ سَمْ مِنْ غَيْرِهِ جَمْعٌ وَمِنْ قَرْأَهُ بِنَفْسِهِ عَلَى الشَّيْخِ اغْرَدَ فَقَالَ أَخْبَرْنِي وَهُذَا مَسْتَحْسِنٌ وَلَيْسَ بِوَاجِبٍ عِنْدَهُ وَانْهَا أَرْدَادُ التَّمْبَيِّزِ بَيْنَ احْوَالِ التَّحْمِلِ

“There are some who think that there should be a difference in the form of reporting tradition, with reference to a distinction in the mode of taking it up, and accordingly appropriate the expression حَدَثَ to what the master gives out orally, and أَخْبَرَ to what is read to him. Such was the doctrine of ‘Ibn Juraij, ‘al-Auzā’i, ‘ash-Shāfi’i, and ‘Ibn Wahab,† and of all the people of the West; and the later masters have originated another distinction, according to which whoever, himself alone, hears a master speak, uses the single number and says حَدَّشْنِي, and whoever hears as one of several uses the plural number, while he who

* p. 282.

† ‘Ibn Juraij died A. H. 150; ‘al-Auzā’i, one of the teachers of ‘Ibn Juraij, and a resident of Bairūt, d. A. H. 151; ‘ash-Shāfi’i, a native of Gaza, who became a resident of Egypt, and the founder of a school of Muslini law, d. A. H. 204; ‘Ibn Wahab of Egypt d. A. H. 197. These dates are derived from the *Kitāb Tabakāt ‘al-Hufāz* (v. 9, v. 20, vii. 36) ed. by Wüstenfeld under the title *Liber Classium Virorum qui Korani et Traditionum Cognit. excell., auct. Abu Abdalla Dahabio*. In epit. coegit et contin. *Anonymous . . . Gottingue, 1833-34*: to which we shall refer hereafter, as we may have occasion, simply as the *Kitāb Tabakāt*.

himself reads to a master says in the singular number أخْبَرْنِي—which is approved, though not necessary in the opinion of those just referred to, who only meant to distinguish between modes of taking up tradition."

A farther distinction of form in the reporting of tradition, which we find in the collections, is the use of سمعت instead of either حَدَّثَنِي or أخْبَرْنِي. This is a comprehensive expression, denoting of itself simply the fact of hearing from a master, without indication of the mode; but the technical phraseology of Muslim traditionists distinguishes it, in an artificial manner, from both the other expressions. Such seems, at least, to be the import of the following words in Muslim's introduction: فيَخْبِرُونَ بِالنَّزْولِ "narrating on the ascending grade [by سمعت] if they proceed upwards, and on the descending grade [by أخْبَرْنِي if they proceed downwards."

In the extract from J. last given, it is stated that objection had been made by some to any reporting of tradition except by memory. We therefore present, here, from B., a statement of earlier opinion as to the propriety of reporting by the pupil's reading, and by the form called "presentation." It is to be found in that book of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* which is entitled Book of the Science (كتاب العلم):

باب القراءة والعرض على الحديث

ورأى الحسن والشوري ومالك القراءة جائزة واحتتج بعضهم في القراءة على العالم بحديث ضمام بن ثعلبة قال للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الله أمرك أن نصلى الصلاة قال نعم قال فهذه قراءة على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أخبر ضمام قومه بذلك فاجازوه واحتتج مالك بالشك يقرأ على القوم فيقولون أشهدنا فلانا ويقرأ على المقرئ فيقول الغاري أقرأني فلان حدثنا محمد بن سلام ثنا محمد بن الحسن الواسطي عن عوف عن الحسن قال لا بأس بالقراءة على العالم وحدثنا عبيد الله بن موسى عن سفيان قال اذا قرأ على الحديث فلا بأس ان يقول حدثني وسمعت ابا عاصم يقول عن مالك وسفيان القراءة على العالم وقراءته سواء حدثنا عبد الله بن يوسف ثنا الليث عن سعيد هو المقبرى عن شريك بن عبد الله بن ابي نمر انه سمع انس بن مالك رضى الله عنه يقول بينما نحن جلوس مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في المسجد دخل رجل على جمل فانداخه في المسجد ثم عقله

فَرَأَى قَلْبَهُ لَهُمْ أَيُّكُمْ مُحَمَّدٌ وَالنَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ مُنْتَكِيُّ بَيْنَ ظَهَارِنِيهِمْ فَقَلَّنَا
هَذَا الرَّجُلُ الْأَيْيَضُ الْمُنْتَكِيُّ فَقَالَ لَهُ الرَّجُلُ يَا ابْنَ عَبْدِ الْمُطَلَّبِ فَقَالَ لَهُ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ قَدْ أَجْبَتْكَ فَقَالَ الرَّجُلُ لِلنَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَنِّي سَابِيلِكَ فَشَدَّدَ عَلَيْكَ فِي الْمُسْبِلَةِ فَلَا تَجِدُ عَلَيْهِ فِي نَفْسِكَ فَقَالَ سَلَّمَ عَمَّا
بَدَا لَكَ فَقَالَ أَسْأَلُكَ بِرَبِّكَ وَرَبِّ مَنْ قَبْلَكَ اللَّهُ أَرْسَلَكَ إِلَيْنَا نَاسٌ كَلَّهُمْ فَقَالَ
اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ قَالَ انْشَدَكَ بِاللَّهِ أَمْرَكَ أَنْ نَصْلِيَ الصَّلَوَاتَ الْخَمْسَ قَالَ اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ
قَالَ انْشَدَكَ بِاللَّهِ أَمْرَكَ أَنْ نَصُومَ هَذَا الشَّهْرَ مِنَ السَّنَةِ قَالَ اللَّهُمَّ نَعَمْ قَالَ
انْشَدَكَ بِاللَّهِ أَمْرَكَ أَنْ تَأْخُذَ هَذِهِ الصَّدَقَةَ مِنْ أَغْنِيَائِنَا فَتَنَقَّسَهَا عَلَى
فَقَرَأْيَا إِنَّمَا فَقَالَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ فَقَالَ الرَّجُلُ أَمِنْتَ بِمَا جَيَّبْتَ
بِهِ وَإِنَّ رَسُولَنَا مَرْأَى مِنْ قَوْمٍ وَإِنَّمَا ضَمَّمَ بْنَ ثَعْلَبَةَ أَخْوَيْنِي سَعْدَ بْنَ بَكْرٍ
رَوَاهُ مُوسَى وَعَلَى بْنِ عَبْدِ الْمُمْبِدِ عَنْ سَلِيمَانَ عَنْ ثَابِتٍ عَنْ أَنَسٍ عَنِ النَّبِيِّ
صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بِهِذَا

بِأَنَّ بَلَبَ مَا يَذَكُرُ فِي الْمَنَاوِلَةِ وَكِتَابِ أَهْلِ الْعِلْمِ بِالْعِلْمِ إِلَيْ الْبَلَدَانِ
وَقَالَ أَنَسٌ نَسْخَ عَثْمَانَ الْمَصَاحِفَ فَبَعَثَ بِهَا إِلَيْ الْأَفَاقِ وَرَأَى عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ
عُمَرَ وَجْهَيْنِ بْنِ سَعِيدٍ وَمَالِكَ ذَلِكَ جَابِرَا وَاحْتَجَ بَعْضُ أَهْلِ الْمَجَازِ فِي الْمَنَاوِلَةِ
بِحَدِيثِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حِيثُ كَتَبَ لِأَمْيَرِ السَّرِيَّةِ كِتَابًا وَفَالَّذِي
نَقَرَأَ حَتَّى تَبَلَّغَ مَكَانَ كَذِّ وَكَذِّ فَلَمَّا بَلَغَ ذَلِكَ الْمَكَانَ قَرَأَهُ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَأَخْبَرَهُمْ
بِأَمْرِ النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ حَدَّثَنَا أَبْمَا عَبِيلَ بْنَ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ حَدَّثَنِي أَبْرَاهِيمَ بْنَ
سَعْدٍ عَنْ صَالِحٍ عَنْ أَبِي شَهَابٍ عَنْ عَبِيدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ عَتْبَةِ بْنِ
مَسْعُودٍ أَنَّ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ بْنَ عَبَّاسَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا أَخْبَرَهُ أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ
عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ بَعَثَ بِكِتَابَهُ رَجْلًا وَامْرَأَ أَنْ يَدْفَعَهُ إِلَى عَظِيمِ الْجَرَبِينِ فَدَفَعَهُ عَظِيمُ
الْبَحْرِيِّينَ إِلَى كَسْرِيِّ فَلَمَّا قَرَأَهُ مَرْقَهُ فَحَسِبَتْ أَنَّ أَبِنَ الْمَسِيبِ قَالَ فَدَعَا
عَلَيْهِمْ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَنْ يَبْتَقِوا كُلَّ مَرْقَهٍ حَدَّثَنَا مُحَمَّدُ بْنُ
مَقَاتِلِ أَبْوَ الْحَسِنِ أَنَّ عَبْدَ اللَّهِ أَنَا شَعْبَةُ عَنْ قَنْدَادَةِ أَنَسِ بْنِ مَالِكِ رَضِيَ
اللَّهُ عَنْهُ قَالَ كَتَبَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كِتَابًا أَوْ ارَادَ أَنْ يَكْتُبَ فَقِيلَ لَهُ
أَنَّهُمْ لَا يَقْرُؤُنَ كِتَابًا لَا يَخْتُومُهُ فَاتَّخَذَ خَاتِمًا مِنْ فَضَّةٍ نَقْشَهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
كَانَى أَنْظَرَ إِلَى بِيَاضِهِ فِي يَدِهِ فَقَلَتْ لَقْنَتِادَةُ مِنْ قَالَ نَقْشَهُ مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
قَالَ أَنَسٌ

“Chapter on Reading to and Laying before the Teacher of Tradition.

“Al-Hasan, ‘ath-Thauri, and Mâlik* regarded the reading of tradition as allowable; and some have alleged, in favor of reading to a well-informed teacher, a tradition of Dhimâm Bin Tha’labah, who said to the Prophet . . .: ‘Hath God commanded thee that we should pray with the prescribed form of prayer?’ to which he replied: ‘Yes,’ and the other rejoined: ‘Then is this something to be read to the Prophet’—of which Dhimâm informed his people, who accordingly regarded the incident as an authoritative guide. Mâlik adduces in proof the case of a judicial sentence which is read to people, who thereupon say: ‘We call such a one to witness,’ or which is read to one who causes it to be read, whereupon the reader says: ‘Such a one made me read.’

Muhammad Bin Salâm tells us for a tradition, as told by Muhammad Bin ‘al-Hasan ‘al-Wâsîti, on the authority of ‘Auf, from ‘al-Hasan: ‘There is no harm in reading to a well-informed teacher;’ and we are told by ‘Ubaidallâh Bin Mûsa, from Sufyân, as follows: ‘In case one reads to the teacher of tradition, there is no harm in his saying: ‘Such a one tells me for a tradition,’’ and I have heard from ‘Abu-‘Âsim, on the authority of Mâlik and Sufyân, the following: ‘Reading to a well-informed teacher and his reading are equivalent.’

‘Abdallâh Bin Yûsuf tells us for a tradition, as told by ‘al-Laith, on the authority of Sa’id, namely ‘al-Makbari, on the authority of Sharik Bin ‘Abdallâh Bin ‘Abû-Namir, that the latter heard ‘Anas Bin Mâlik—to whom may God be gracious!—say: ‘While we were seated with the Prophet . . . in the mosque, a man entered upon a camel, which he made kneel within the mosque, and afterwards fettered, and then said: “Which of you is Muhammad?”’—the Prophet being supported in the midst of the group—to which we replied: ‘This pure man who leans here.’ Then the man said to him: ‘O son of ‘Abd ‘al-Muttalib—’ and the Prophet . . . replied: ‘Be sure, I will answer thee;’ upon which the man said to the Prophet . . .: ‘I have a question to ask thee, and I insist upon an answer; so be not adverse to me,’ and the Prophet . . . said: ‘Ask about what thou wilt,’ whereupon the man rejoined: ‘I ask thee, by thy Lord and the Lord of those before thee, hath God sent thee as a messenger to all men?’ and the Prophet replied: ‘O God, yes,’ the man said, again: ‘I adjure thee by God, hath God commanded thee that we should pray the five prayers?’ and he replied: ‘O God, yes,’ said the man: ‘I adjure thee by God, hath God commanded thee that we should fast this month of the year?’ and he replied: ‘O God, yes,’ said the man: ‘I adjure thee by God, hath God commanded thee to take this offering of alms from our rich men, and to divide it among our poor?’ and the Prophet answered: ‘O God, yes.’ Then the man said: ‘I trust in thy message, and will be a messenger to those who shall come after me, of my people—and I am Dhimâm Bin Tha’labah, a brother of the tribe of Sa’ad Bin Bakr’—a

* ‘Ath-Thauri, of Kûfah, died A. H. 169; Mâlik Bin ‘Anas of Hirah, the founder of one of the schools of Muslim law, who is probably the Mâlik here mentioned, died A. H. 179. See *Kitâb Tabâkât*, v. 40, 41.

tradition which is reported by Mūsa and 'Ali Bin 'Abd 'al-Hamid, on the authority of Sulaimān, on the authority of 'Anas, from the Prophet . . .

“To this add the following.

“*Chapter of Statements respecting Presentation, and the Communication of the Science to the Provinces, by its Cultivators, in Writing.*

“Says 'Anas: ‘Uthmān caused the standard copies of the *Kurān* to be written out, and sent them to the several quarters;’ and 'Abdallāh Bin 'Umar, Yahya Bin Sa'īd,* and Mālik regarded this as a lawful mode of communication; moreover, some people of the *Hijāz* allege, in favor of presentation, a tradition of the Prophet . . . to the effect that he wrote an order for the captain of a troop of horse, and said: ‘Read not until thou reachest the place so and so,’ and that, accordingly, after the man had reached that place, he read it to the troopers, and informed them of the order of the Prophet . . .”

“Ismā'il Bin 'Abdallāh tells us for a tradition, as told to him by 'Ibrāhīm Bin Sa'ad, on the authority of Sālih, on the authority of 'Abd Shīhāb, on the authority of 'Ubaidallāh Bin 'Utbah Bin Mas'ūd, that 'Abdallāh Bin 'Abbās—may God be gracious to them both!—told him that the Messenger of God . . . sent a written order of his to a certain man, and commanded him to remit it to the chief of 'al-Bahrain; whereupon the chief of 'al-Bahrain remitted it to the Emperor, who, after reading, tore it—in connection with which, as I think, 'Ibn 'al-Masīb says: ‘so the Messenger of God . . . gave it strictly in charge to his people that they should tear every one who tears.’

“Muhammad Bin Muqātil 'Abu-l-Hasan tells us for a tradition, as communicated by 'Abdallāh, as communicated by Shu'bah, on the authority of Kūtādah, on the authority of 'Anas Bin Mālik—to whom may God be gracious!—the following: ‘The Prophet of God . . . wrote, or had a mind to write, an order; whereupon it was said to him that the persons concerned would read no writing not sealed; and so, while I was looking at the paper in his hand, he grasped a silver seal, the inscription upon which was “Muhammad the Messenger of God.” Said I to Kūtādah, on hearing this: “Who said that ‘Muhammad the Messenger of God’ was inscribed upon it?” to which he replied: “'Anas.”’”

It will be perceived that the applicability of several of the traditions reported in the foregoing passage from the *Sahīh*, to the particular points which they are intended to illustrate, depends upon their involving general principles which the example of the Prophet established; and, indeed, the whole of the Book of the Science appears to refer, not to that which is pre-eminently the science of the *Muslīms*—namely, the system of tradition—alone, but to all departments of instruction, in general. The same sort of illustration from general principles is found, also, in another chapter of that book, entitled باب كتابة العلم, i. e. Chapter on Committing the Science to Writing, which, being

* Yahya Bin Sa'īd died A. H. 194, aged 80 years. See *Kitāb Tab.*, vi. 77.

made up of reported instances of the Prophet's writing down what he wished to preserve for the instruction of others, is supposed to sanction the substitution of writing for oral statement by the teacher of tradition.

We will now cite a few other brief chapters from this same book of the *Sahih*, for the sake of similar illustration of different points pertaining to the order of a school of tradition. The first to be cited relates to the age at which one may hear instruction in traditional science.*

باب متى يصحّ سماع الصبي الصغير

حدثنا أسماعيل حدثني مالك عن ابن شهاب عن عبيد الله بن عبد الله بن عتبة عن عبد الله بن عباس رضي الله عنهما قال أقبلت راكبا على حمار لanan وانا يوميذ قد ناهزت الاحتلام ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يصلى علني الى غير جدار فمررت بين يدي بعض الصف وارسلت الا ان ترتع ودخلت في الصف فلم ينكر ذلك على احد حدثنا محمد بن يوسف ثنا ابو سهر حدثني محمد بن حرب حدثني الزبيدي عن الزهرى عن محمد بن الربيع رضي الله عنه قال عقلت من النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مجحة مجها في وجهي وابن خمس سنين من دلو

“Chapter on the Propriety of a Stripling's Hearing Tradition.

“Ismā’il tells us, as told to him by Mālik, on the authority of ‘Ibn Shihāb, on the authority of ‘Ubaidallāh Bin ‘Abdallāh Bin ‘Utbah, from ‘Abdallāh Bin ‘Abbās—may God be gracious to both!—that the latter said: “I arrived mounted upon a female ass, having at the time nearly reached manhood, while the Prophet . . . was praying from Mina to Ghair Jidār; so I passed on in front of some of the train, having let my beast go at large with the words: “now mayst thou feed well,” and joined the train without any one's blaming me for so doing.

“Muhammad Bin Yūsuf tells us, as told by ‘Abū-Mushir, as told to him by Muhammad Bin Harb, as told to him by ‘az-Zubaidi, on the authority of ‘az-Zuhri, from Maḥmūd Bin ‘ar-Rabī’—to whom may God be gracious!—that the latter said: ‘I paid to the Prophet . . . the forfeit for a drop of wine which trickled on my face from a cup, when I was a boy of five years.’”†

The following refer to tokens of respect due to the teacher:‡

* fol. 6, rect.

† That is to say, even a boy of five years of age, being chargeable with disobedience to a law of the Prophet, might be made responsible for the transmission of tradition.

‡ fol. 7, rect.; fol. 8, rect.

باب من برك على ركبتيه عند الامام او الحدث

حدثنا ابو اليهان انا شعيب عن الزهري اخبرني انس بن مالك رضي الله عنه ان رسول الله صلی الله عليه وسلم خرج فقام عبد الله بن حذافة قال من ابى فقال ابوك حذافة ثم اكثرا ان يقول سلونى فيرك عمر على ركبتيه فقال رضينا بالله ربنا وبالاسلام ديننا وباحمد ذببا فسكت

“Chapter about one’s Kneeling before the ‘Imām, or the Teacher of Tradition.”

“Abu-l-Yamān tells us, as communicated by Shu’āib, on the authority of ‘az-Zuhrī, as communicated to him by ‘Anas Bin Mālik—to whom may God be gracious!—that the Messenger of God . . . went out once upon a time, when he was accosted by ‘Abdallāh Bin Hudhāfah, saying: ‘Who was my father,’ to which he replied: ‘Thy father was Hudhāfah,’ and then said several times: ‘Question me,’ whereupon ‘Umar knelt down and said: ‘We accept God for our Lord, Islām for our religion, and Muhammad for our prophet,’ and was silent.”

باب الانصات العلماء

حدثنا حجاج ثنا شعبة اخبرني على بن مدرك عن ابى زرعة بن عمرو عن جرير رضي الله عنه ان النبى صلی الله عليه وسلم قال له في حجۃ الوداع استنصرت الناس فقال لا ترجعوا بعدى كفارا يضرب بعضكم رقب بعض

“Chapter on the Commanding of Silence by the Masters of the Science.”

“Hajjāj tells us, as told by Shu’bah, as communicated to him by ‘Alī Bin Mūdrīk, on the authority of ‘Abtū-Zur’ah Bin ‘Amrū, on the authority of Jarīr—to whom may God be gracious!—that the Prophet of God . . . said to the latter, when giving his farewell testimony: ‘Bid the men be silent,’ after which he said: ‘Become not infidels, again, after I am gone, by smiting each other’s necks.’”

باب من سأله وهو قائمه عالمنا جالسا

حدثنا عثمان ثنا جرير عن منصور عن ابى دايل عن ابى موسى قال جاء رجل الى النبى صلی الله عليه وسلم فقال يرسول الله ما القتال في سبيل الله عن وجل فان احذنا يقاتل غصبا ويقاتل حمية فرفع اليه رأسه قال وما رفع اليه رأسه الا انه كلن قائما فقال من قاتل لتكون كلمة الله في العلية فهو في سبيل الله

“Chapter on one’s Making Inquiry, in a Standing Posture, of a Master of the Science Seated.”

“Uthmān tells us, as told by Jarīr, on the authority of Mānsūr, on the authority of ‘Abū-Wā’il, on the authority of ‘Abū-Mūsa, that the latter

said: 'There came a man to the Prophet . . . and said: "O Messenger of God, what is it to fight in the way of God?—may He be magnified and glorified!—for one of us fights with anger and indignation; whereupon he lifted his head to him' (says the relator: 'and the Prophet would not have lifted his head to him, unless the latter had been standing') 'and said: "Whoever fights in order that the word of God may be the supreme word, he is in the way of God.''"

Another chapter bears upon the question of the admissibility of women to the hearing of tradition, as follows:*

باب عظة الامام النساء وتعليمهن

حدثنا سليمان بن حرب ثنا شعبة عن ايوب قال سمعت عطاء قل سمعت بن عباس رضي الله عنهما قل اشهد على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم او قل عطاء اشهد على ابن عباس ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خرج ومعه بلال فظن انه لا يسمع النساء فوعظهن وامرهن بالصدقة فجعلت المرأة تلقى القرط والخاتم وبلال يأخذ في طرف ثوبه و قال اسماعيل عن ايوب عن عطاء قال ابن عباس اشهد على النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

"Chapter on the Warning and Instructing of Women by the 'Imām."

"Salaimān Bin Harb tells us, as told by Shu'bah, on the authority of 'Aiyūb, who said that he had heard 'Atā' say that he had heard 'Ibn 'Abbās—may God be gracious to both!—say: 'I call the Prophet of God . . . to witness' (or, otherwise, that he had heard 'Atā' say: 'I call 'Ibn 'Abbās to witness') that the Prophet of God . . . went out, once upon a time, attended by Bilāl: now it was supposed that the Prophet did not cause women to hear his teachings; he took occasion, therefore, at this time, to warn the sex, and to bid them give alms; in consequence of which the women began to carry themselves haughtily, and Bilāl laid hold of the hem of the Prophet's garment.' Another form of the tradition is that 'Ismā'il says on the authority of 'Aiyūb, on the authority of 'Atā', that 'Ibn 'Abbās said: 'I call the Prophet of God . . . to witness, etc.'"

This question touching the rights of women is settled by J. to the same effect, in a paragraph already quoted:†

وَلَا يُشَرِّطُ الذُّكُورُ وَلَا الْمُرْبَثَةُ وَلَا الْعِلْمُ بِفَقْهِهِ وَغَرِيبِهِ وَلَا الْبَصْرُ وَلَا الْعَدْدُ

"The being of the male sex is not made a condition [of the responsible teacher], nor freedom, nor knowledge of the jurisprudence based upon tradition, or of any thing foreign to the subject, nor sight, nor the being one of many."

To pursue the subject of the transmission of tradition, after the foregoing exhibition of the qualifications of the reliable re-

* fol. 7, rect.

† See p. 63.

porter, the several ways of communication which are admissible, and the disposition required in the pupil, we have next to turn our attention to certain circumstances of form relative to tradition itself, in respect to which there are important distinctions involved in the science under consideration.

Every tradition (الرواية), or report (المرأة), consists of two parts: 1. the text (المتن), which J. defines in these words:*

المتن هو الفاظ للحديث التي يتقدّم بها المعانى "the text, which consists of those words of the tradition by which sentiments are established," and H. as follows:†

والمتن ما انتهى اليه الاسناد "and the text is that with which the allegation of authority ends;"

and 2. the support (السند), defined by J. thus:‡

السند اخبار عن طريق المتن "the support is information of the way by which the text has come down,"

and by H.:§

السند طريق الحديث وهو رجاله الذين رودوه "the support is the course of descent of the tradition, consisting of its guarantees, by whom it is reported."

The term **الاسناد** is often used as synonymous with **السند**, though properly signifying "the action of supporting." J. says:||

الاسناد هو رفع الحديث الى قائله "the term denotes the carrying up of tradition to its original enunciator;"

and H. says:¶

والاسناد بمعناه وقد يجيء بمعنى ذكر السند والحكاية عن طريق المتن "the term has the same meaning [as **السند**], but is also, indeed, used to signify the statement of the support, and the giving account of the way by which a text has come down."

The text of a tradition consists either of a saying (القول), or of an action (الفعل), or of a confirmation (التفير), of the Prophet; of which the last is involved in the two former, according to a definition of it which H. gives us:**

ومعنى التفير انه فعل احد او قال شيئا في حضرته صلى الله عليه وسلم
وذر ينكرة وذر ينها عن ذلك بل سكت وقرر

* page 1.

|| page 1.

† fol. 1, rect.

¶ fol. 1, rect.

‡ page 1.

** fol. 1, rect.

§ fol. 1, rect.

“the term التقوير signifies that some one either did or said something in the presence of the Prophet . . . and that he did not blame him, nor forbid him to do or say that thing, but on the contrary was silent and confirmed it.”

What is to be understood by a saying, and by an action, of the Prophet, as constituting the substance of tradition, is set forth in the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* . . . in the following passage:*

وعلم الحديث علم تعرف به اقوال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وافعاله
اما اقواله عليه الصلة والسلام في كلام العربي فن لم يعرف حال الكلام
العربي فهو معزول عن هذا العلم وهو كونه حقيقة ومحاجة وكتابية وصريحا وعاما
وخالصا ومطلقا ومتقدما ومنطقا ومنورا ومحظوظا ذلك مع كونه على قانون
العربية الذي بينه النهاية بتضليله وعلى قواعد استعمال العرب وهو المعتبر
بعلم اللغة واما افعاله عليه الصلة والسلام في الامور الصادرة عنه التي
امروا باتباعها فيها او لا كالافعال الصادرة عنه طبعا او خاصة

“The science of tradition is that by which sayings and actions of the Prophet . . . are authenticated. As to his sayings . . . , they consist of discourse in the Arabic language; so that one who is not familiar with the genius of Arabic discourse can not attain to this science. What is said is something by itself or in its connection, metaphorical or literal, general or special, absolute or qualified, express or implied, and the like, in conformity with the rules of the Arabic language, as set forth distinctively by the grammarians, and with the principles of Arab usage, exhibited in the science of lexicography. As to his actions . . . , they are things of which he set the example, whether he commanded us to imitate him therein or not—for instance, actions which he exemplified out of natural impulse or in consequence of some individual peculiarity.”

This classification of the texts of tradition will facilitate the understanding of certain expressions in passages presently to be quoted from our authorities. With respect to the comparative weight of a tradition, however, its support, and not its text, is primarily considered: in other words, the Muslim man of the law receives or rejects tradition on external evidence, rather than internal. J. tells us expressly:†

اعلم ان متن الحديث نفسه لا يدخل في الاعتبار الا نادرا بل يكتسب
صفة من القوة والضعف وبين بين بحسب اوصاف الرواية من العدالة
والصيغة والحفظ وخلافها وبين ذلك وبحسب الاسناد من الاتصال والانقطاع
والارسال والاضطراب ومحوها فالحديث على هذا ينقسم الى صحيح وحسن

وضعيف هذا اذا نظر الى المتن واما اذا نظر الى اوصاف الرواية فقبل هو ثقة عدل صابط او غير ثقة او منهم او مجهول او كذوب او حموذل فيكون البحث عن الجرح والتعديل اذا نظر الى كيفية اخذهم وطرق تحملهم الحديث كان البحث عن اوصاف الطالب اذا بحث عن اسمائهم وانسابهم كان البحث عن تعبيينهم وتشخيص ذواهم فانقاد مرتبة على اربعة ابواب

“Be it known that the text itself of a tradition is but rarely taken into account: on the contrary, a tradition is qualified as strong, or weak, or intermediate, with reference to the qualities of integrity, retentiveness, and good memory, and their opposites and intermediates, possessed by the reporters, as well as with reference to continuousness (الاتصال) or disseverance (الانقطاع), looseness (الارسال), instability (الاضطراب), and the like, in the support: on this ground, then, tradition is divided into sound (صحيح), fair (حسن), and weak (ضعيف). When reference is made to the qualities of reporters, one is said to be reliable (ثقة), upright (عدل), retentive (صابط), or not reliable (غير ثقة), fanciful (منهم), ignored (مجهول), false (كذوب), and the like—giving rise to discussion in respect to confutation (الجرح) and approbation (التعديل). When the question is, how the reporters came to get a tradition, and by what ways they took it up, there arises discussion in respect to modes of pursuing inquiry. When their names and surnames are looked into, there is inquisition regarding their identification and individualization. Consequently, our propositions are arranged in four chapters.”

We proceed, therefore, to follow our authorities in their definitions of certain varieties of support to tradition, which constitute, together with distinctions in regard to the qualifications of the responsible teacher, the chief ground of the classification of tradition as sound, fair, or weak. From the definition of the science of tradition with which we began, and which is substantially repeated in our last quotation from the *Dictionary of the Technical Terms* . . ., it is obvious that the ultimate design of what is called “the support” must be to attach the authority of Muhammad to some saying or action reported as his, or sanctioned by him; and here is to be observed, in the first place, that tradition is said to be carried back to the Prophet either positively or potentially, as in the following passage from H.:*

والمفع قد يكون صريحاً وقد يكون حكماً أما صريحاً ففي القولى كفول
الصحابى سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول كذا أو قوله أو قوله
غيرة قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أو عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه

* fol. 1, rect.

وسلم انه قال كذا او في الفعلى كقول الصحابى رأيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فعل كذا او عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم انه فعل كذا او عن الصحابى او غيره مرفوعا او رفعه انه فعل كذا او في التقريرى ان يقول الصحابى او غيره فعل فلان او احد بحضور النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم كذا ولا يذكر انكاره واما حكما فكاخبار الصحابى الذى لم يخبر عن الктتب المتقدمة ما لا مجال فيه للاجتهاد عن الاحوال الماضية كاخبار الانبياء او الایة كالملاحم والقتن واحوال يوم القيمة او عن ترتيب ثواب مخصوص او عقاب مخصوص على فعل فانه لا سبيل اليه الا السماع عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم او يفعل الصحابى ما لا مجال للاجتهاد فيه او يخبر الصحابى بانهم كانوا يفعلون كذا في زمان النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم لان الظاهر اطلاعه صلى الله عليه وسلم على ذلك ونقول الوحي به او يقولون او من السنة كذا لان الظاهر ان السنة سنة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال بعضهم انه يحتمل سنة الصحابة وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين فان السنة يطلق عليه

“The carrying back (الرفع) is either positive or potential.

“As to carrying back positively, that, in the case of a tradition of saying, is exemplified by this declaration of a witness of the Prophet: ‘I heard the Messenger of God . . . say so and so,’ or by his or another’s saying: ‘Said the Messenger of God . . .’ (or, ‘It comes from the Messenger of God . . . that he said’) ‘so and so;’ or, in the case of a tradition of action, by the declaration of a witness of the Prophet: ‘I saw the Messenger of God . . . do so and so,’ or ‘It comes from the Messenger of God . . . that he did so and so,’ or by the expression: ‘It comes from a witness of the Prophet’ (or, ‘from some one else’), ‘as a tradition carried back’ (or, ‘which he carried back to the Prophet’), ‘that he did so and so;’ or, in the case of a tradition of confirmation, by the declaration of a witness of the Prophet, or of some one else, in the following words: ‘Such a one’ (or, ‘A certain person’) ‘did so and so in the presence of the Prophet, and there is no account of his blaming him.’

“As to carrying back potentially, that is exemplified by those statements of a witness of the Prophet which he makes independently of the authority of ancient books, and which cannot be ascribed to human caprice (الاجتهاد), respecting circumstances of past time, such as stories of the prophets or imâms—their conflicts and trials, for instance—and respecting the terrors of the day of judgment, or the assignment to a certain action of a special reward, or a special punishment; for such information can have been obtained only by a hearing from the Prophet... The potential carrying back may, also, be exemplified by the doing, on the part of a witness of the Prophet, of something in which human

caprice could have had no concern; or by his telling that people did so and so in the time of the Prophet . . . or said so and so, inasmuch as it is obvious that the Prophet . . . must have given the suggestion, and that by divine inspiration; or by the expression: 'so and so is a part of the Sunnah,' for the Sunnah is plainly the traditional law of the Messenger of God . . . , though some persons say that the term may signify the traditional law of the Prophet's Companions and the traditional law of his orthodox successors, in which case Sunnah becomes a generic word."

When, therefore, the authority of the Prophet is either positively or potentially attached to a tradition, it is said to be carried back (مروي); otherwise, it is said to be stopped (موقوف). But the varieties of support to tradition respect not the last link, alone, in the chain of connection with the Prophet: in determining the quality of the support belonging to a particular tradition, the whole series of attestations through which it is handed down must also be considered. If all those which precede the last follow one another in uninterrupted succession, each reporter having derived the tradition immediately from him who is named next before him in the support, the tradition is said to be continuous (متصل): and this continuousness, combined with the carrying back to the Prophet, constitutes a sustained (مسند) tradition, that is, a tradition of which the support is perfect. Uninterruptedness of succession, however, is far from marking the descent of every tradition; and hence arise technical distinctions with reference to the several ways in which the want of it appears. The following passage from H. sets forth the more important of these distinctions:*

فَإِنْ لَمْ يَسْقُطْ رَأْوَ مِنَ الرِّوَاةِ مِنَ الْبَيْنِ فَالْحَدِيثُ مَتَّصِلٌ وَيُسَمَّى بِعَدَمِ السَّقْطَةِ
أَنْتَصِلًا وَإِنْ يَسْقُطْ وَاحِدًا أَوْ أَكْثَرَ فَالْحَدِيثُ مُنْقَطِعٌ وَهَذَا السَّقْطَةُ اِنْقِطَاعٌ
وَالسَّقْطَةُ إِمَّا أَنْ يَكُونَ مِنَ الْسَّنْدِ وَيُسَمَّى مَعْلَقًا وَهَذَا الْاسْقَاطُ تَعْلِيقًا
وَالسَّاقَطُ قَدْ يَكُونَ وَاحِدًا وَقَدْ يَكُونَ أَكْثَرًا وَقَدْ يُحَذَّفُ تَحْمِلَ السَّنْدَ كَمَا
هُوَ عَادَةُ الْمُصَنَّفِيْنَ يَقُولُونَ قَالَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَالْتَّعْلِيقَاتُ
كَثِيرَةٌ فِي تَرَاجِمِ صَحِيحِ الْبَخَارِيِّ وَلَهَا حُكْمُ الاتِّصَالِ لَأَنَّهُ تَنَزَّمُ فِي هَذَا الْكِتَابِ
أَنْ لَا يَأْتِي إِلَّا بِالصَّحِيحِ وَلَكِنَّهَا لَيْسَتْ فِي مَرْتَبَةِ مَسَانِيدٍ إِلَّا مَا ذُكِرَ مِنْهَا
مَسَانِيدًا فِي مَوْضِعٍ أُخْرَى كِتَابَهُ وَقَدْ يَفْرَقُ فِيهَا بَيْنَ مَا ذُكِرَ بِصِيغَةِ الْجَزْمِ وَالْعِلْمِ
كَقُولَةٍ قَالَ فَلَمَّا دَلَّ عَلَى تَبْوِئِ اسْنَادِهِ عَنْهُ فَهُوَ صَحِيحٌ قَطْنَعًا وَمَا ذُكِرَ بِصِيغَةِ
الْتَّنْمِيرِيْضِ وَالْجَهْوَلِ كَقِيلٍ وَبِقَالٍ وَذَكْرٍ فَفِي صَحَّتِهِ عَنْهُ كَلَامٌ وَلَكِنَّهُ لَمَّا أُورَدَ فِي

* fol. 1, rect. and vers.

هذا الكتاب كان له أصل ثابت وبهذا قالوا تعليلات البخاري متصلة صحيحة وإن كان السقوط من آخر السنن فإن كان بعد التابع فالأحاديث مرسل وهذا الفعل أرسال كقول التابع قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد يجيء عند الحدثين المرسل والمنقطع بمعنى والاصطلاح الأول أشهر وحكم المرسل التوقف عند جمهور العلماء لأنه لا يدرى أن الساقط ثقة أو لا لأن التابع قد يروى عن التابع وفي التابعين ثقات وغير ثقات وعند أبي حنيفة ومالك المرسل مقبول مطلقاً ومم يقولون إنما أرسله لكمال الوثوق والاعتماد لأن الكلام في الثقة ولو لم يكن عند محياناً لم يرسله وقد يقل قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وعند الشافعى أن اعتضد بوجه آخر مرسل أو مسنن وإن كان ضعيفاً قبل وعن أحمد قولان وهذا كله إذا علم أن عادة ذلك التابع أن لا يرسل إلا عن الثقات وإن كانت عادته أن يرسل عن الثقات وعن غير الثقات فحكمه التوقف بالاتفاق كذا قبل وفيه تفصيل أزيد من ذلك ذكره الساخاوي في شرح الالغية وإن كان السقوط من اثناء الأسناد فإن كان الساقط اثنين متولايا يسمى مفضلاً بفتح الصاد وإن كان واحداً أو أكثر من غير موضع واحد يسمى منقطعاً وعلى هذا يكون المنقطع قسماً من غير المتصدّل وقد يطلق المنقطع بمعنى غير المتصدّل مطلقاً شاملًا بجميع الأقسام وبهذا المعنى يجعل مقسمًا ويعرف الانقطاع وسقوط الرأوى بعمره عدم الملافات بين الرأوى والمروى عنه أما بعدم المعاصرة أو عدم الاجتماع والاجازة عنه بحكم علم التأريخ المبين لمواليد الرواية ووفياتهم وتعييين أوقات طلبهما وارتحانهما وبهذا صار علم التأريخ أصلًا وعمدة عند الحدثين ومن اقسام المنقطع المدلّس بضم الميم وفتح اللام المشددة ويقال لهذا الفعل التدليس ولفاعله مدلّس بكسر اللام وصيغته إن لا يسمى الرأوى شيخه الذي سمعه منه بل يروى عن فوقة بلفظ يوم السماع ولا يقطع كذباً كما يقول عن فلان وقل فلان والتدليس في اللغة كتمان عيب السلعة في البيع وقد يقال أنه مشتّق من المدلّس وهو اختلاط الظلام واشتداه سمي به لأن شركهما في الخفاء قال الشيخ وحكم من ثبت عنه التدليس أنه لا يقبل منه إلا إذا صرّح بالتحديث قال الشمني التدليس حرام عند الأئمة روى عن وكيع أنه قال لا يجعل تدليس التوب فكيف بتدليس الحديث وبالغ شبعة في ذمه وقد اختلف العلماء في قبول رواية

المدلس فذهب فريق من أهل الحديث والفقه إلى أن التدلسيس جرح لأن من عرف به لا يقبل حديثه مطلقاً وقيل يقبل وذهب الجمهور إلى قبول تدلسيس من عرف أنه لا يدلس إلا عن ثقة كابن عبيدة والى رد من كان يدلس عن الضعفاء وغيرهم حتى ينصل على سماحة بقوله سمعت أو حدثنا أو أخبرنا والباعث على التدلسيس قد يكون لبعض الناس غرض فاسد مثل اخفاء السمع من الشبيخ لصغر سنّه أو عدم شهرته وجاهه عند الناس والذي وقع من بعض الأكابر ليس مثل هذا بل من جهة وثوقهم لصحة الحديث واستغناء بشهادة الحال قال الشنني يحتمل أن يكون قد سمع الحديث من جماعة من الثقات وعن ذلك الرجل فاستغنى بذكره عن ذكر أحدهم أو ذكر جميعهم لتحقيق بصحة الحديث فيه كما يفعل المرسّل وإن وقع في اسناد أو متن اختلاف من الرواية بتقديم وتأخير أو زيادة ونقصان أو ابدال رأي أو مكان رأي آخر أو متن مكان متن أو تصحيف في اسماء السندي أو اجزاء المتن أو باختصار أو حذف أو مثل ذلك فالحديث مضطرب فإن أمكن الجبع فيها والا فالتوقف وإن ادرج الرواى كلامه أو كلام غيره من مخابى أو تابعى مثلاً لغرض الاغراض كبيان اللغة أو تفسير المعنى أو تقييد المطلق أو نحو ذلك فالحديث مدرج

فصل تنبية

وهذا المبحث يندرج إلى روایة الحديث ونقله بالمعنى وفيه اختلاف فلاكترون على أنه جائزٌ من هو عالم بالعربية وما هو في أساليب اللّام وعَارِف بخواص النّراكيب ومفهومات الخطاب ليلاً يخطي بزيادة ونقصان وقيل جائزٌ في مفردات الالفاظ دون المركبات وقيل جائزٌ من استحضار الفاظه حتى يتمكن من التصرف فيه وقيل جائزٌ من يحفظ معانى الحديث ونسى الفاظها للصبرورة في تحصيل الاحكام وأما من استحضر الالفاظ فلا يجوز له لعدم الصبرورة وهذا الخلاف في الجواز وعدمه أما أولوية روایة اللّفظ من غير تصرف فيها فتفق عليه لقوله صلی الله عليه وسلم نصر الله امراً سمي مقالتي فوعلها فادها كما سمع الحديث والنقل بالمعنى واقع في الكتاب السنّة وغيرها والمعنى روایة الحديث بلفظ عن فلان عن فلان والمعنى حديث روى بطريق العنونة ويشترط في العنونة المعاصرة عند مسلم واللّقى عند

البخاري والأخذ عند قوم اخرين ومسلم رد على الفريقيين اشد الرد وبلغ
فيه وعنده المدارس غير مقبول وكل حديث مرفوع سنه متصل فهو مسند
هذا هو المشهور المعتمد عليه وبعدهم يسمى كل متصل مسندا وان كان موقوفا
او مقطوعا وبعدهم يسمى المرفوع مسند او معلقا او منقطعا

“If no one of the reporters has dropped out from the chain of connection, the tradition is continuous (متصل), and the absence of all dropping out (السقوط) is called continuousness (اتصال). If one reporter has dropped out, or more, the tradition is dissevered (منقطع), and it is this dropping out which constitutes a disseverance (انقطاع).

“The dropping out may be [1] at the beginning of the support, and the tradition is then said to be given summarily (معلق), the letting drop being in this case called a summary statement (تعليق). Either one reporter or more may have dropped out; or the complement of the support may have been entirely left off, after the manner of those authors who say: ‘Said the Messenger of God . . .’ Summary traditions are numerous in the chapters of the *Sahîh* of ‘al-Bukhârî, and are accounted as if they had continuousness, because it is strenuously maintained that this book contains only sound tradition; yet do they not rank with sound traditions which are sustained (مسانيد), except those given as sustained in some other part of ‘al-Bukhârî’s book.

“A distinction, indeed, exists among these summary traditions, on the ground that such of them as are given with an appearance of conciseness, and as something well-known—for example, in the form: ‘Such a one says’—imply the stability of their support in the opinion of ‘al-Bukhârî, so that they are decisively sound; while in the case of such as are given in a form which indicates some defect, and that there is want of knowledge respecting them—for example: ‘It has been said,’ or ‘It is said,’ or ‘It is mentioned’—there may be a question as to ‘al-Bukhârî’s opinion of their soundness, although, inasmuch as he introduces them into that book, they are firmly based, and people, therefore, say that the summary traditions of ‘al-Bukhârî are continuous and sound.

“If the dropping out is [2] at the end of the support, then, in case it comes after a follower of the Prophet in the second degree (التابعى), the tradition is loosened (مسنل)—this participle being derived from the fourth form of the verb: as, for instance, the saying by a follower in the second degree: ‘Said the Messenger of God . . .’ The terms ‘loosened’ and ‘dissevered’ are used, indeed, by teachers of the science as synonymous; but the technical meaning above given to the latter is the most generally received. By most of the doctors, loosened tradition is accounted as stopped, because no one can know whether the reporter who has dropped out was a reliable authority (ثقة) or not, since one follower in the second degree may report on the word of another, and among such followers of the Prophet there were both reliable and unreliable authorities. According to ‘Abû-Hanî-

fah* and Mâlik, however, loosened tradition is generally to be received; and there are those who say that one lets a tradition go loose only because it is wholly indisputable and to be relied upon, since there can be no question except in regard to loosening by a reliable authority, and if, in the opinion of such a one, the tradition was not sound, he would not have let it go loose, and say: 'Said the Messenger of God...' The opinion of 'ash-Shâfi'i was that, provided it be helped out by some other form of it, either loosened or sustained, it is to be received, even though it be weak. From 'Ahmad† we have two declarations of opinion, as follows: 'All this presupposes that the follower in the second degree is known to have been in the habit of letting tradition go loose only when supported by reliable authorities. If he was addicted to letting go loose in dependence upon both reliable and unreliable authorities, the tradition is by common consent adjudged to be stopped.' Such are the different views expressed. A fuller specification relative to the matter is presented by 'as-Sakhâwi in his commentary on the *'Alfiyah'*.‡

"If the dropping out is [3] in the midst of the support, then, in case two consecutive reporters have dropped out, the tradition is called straitened (جَزِيَّة)—the participle being pronounced with *fâth* on the *dhâd*; but, in case only one has dropped out, or more than one, not from the same place, it is called dissevered. Agreeably to this use of terms, dissevered tradition is a subdivision of that which is not continuous: the term 'dissevered' is, indeed, applied to tradition not continuous, in general, as comprehending all species of it; but in the sense here given to it, it becomes a special term.

"The fact of disseverance and of the dropping out of a reporter is ascertained by knowing that there was no concurrence between a certain reporter and one reported from, in consequence either of the want of contemporaneousness or of association, or of the fact that the former was not licensed by the latter, as proved by the science of history, which tells the dates of the births and deaths of reporters, and the special circumstances of the times of their inquiry after traditions and journeying in quest of them: so that history becomes a radical and fundamental science to the teachers of tradition.

"Another of the varieties of dissevered tradition is the disguised (مُدَلَّس)—the participle being pronounced with *dhâmm* on the *mîm*, and *fâth* on the *lâm*, together with *tashdid*: the verbal noun being مُدَلَّس, and the active form of participle مُدَلَّس, with *kâsr* on the *lâm*. Its form depends upon a reporter's not naming his master, from whom he heard the tradition, but reporting on the authority of some one superior to him, in terms which convey the idea of his having heard from this other person, without direct falsehood—as if, for example, he should say: 'On the authority of such a one, so and so,' or

* 'Abû-Hanîfah, the founder of a school of Muslim law, died A. H. 150-53. See *Kitâb Tab.*, v. 8.

† i. e. 'Ahmad Bin Hanbal, the founder of one of the four great schools of Muslim law, who died A. H. 241. See *Kitâb Tab.*, viii. 18.

‡ i. e. the *'Alfiyat 'al-'Irâki*—a work on the principles of tradition. See *Hâjî Khalîf. Lex.*, i. 416, 418. The commentator died A. H. 902.

‘Such a one says so and so.’ In common parlance, the term *اندلبس* has the signification of ‘concealment of the defects of merchandise,’ and is said to be derived from *اندنس*, ‘the involving in darkness, on purpose;’ and the disguising of tradition is said to be called by this term because it partakes of the insidiousness involved in such concealment.

“Says the Shaikh: * ‘It is not judged proper to receive tradition from any one who countenances disguising, except when he distinctly states by whom he was taught.’ Says ‘ash-Shumunni: † ‘In the opinion of the eminent teachers, disguising is forbidden.’ From Waki’‡ it is reported that he said: ‘Disguising in the case of clothes [offered for sale] is unlawful: how then must it be with disguising practised on tradition?’ Shu’bah,§ also, was earnest in condemnation of it. But, as to the reception of the report of one who disguises, there is diversity of sentiment on the part of the doctors. Certain traditionists and jurisconsults think that disguising amounts to a confutation (ج), and that the tradition of any one who is notorious for it is absolutely not to be received; others say that it may be received. Most persons, however, approve of receiving tradition which is disguised by one who is understood to have had, in all cases, good authority for what he disguised, such as Ibn ‘Uyainah, and of rejecting the report of any one accustomed to disguise tradition which he was taught by weak authorities, or others not reliable, except when he expressly declares from whom he heard the tradition, using the words: ‘I have heard,’ or ‘Such a one tells us for a tradition,’ or ‘Such a one informs us.’

“The inducement to disguising, in the case of some men, is certainly a corrupt motive, as, for example, to hide the fact of one’s having heard a tradition from one’s real master, on account of his youth, or his want of reputation and consequence among men. But the disguising practised by some of the great reporters cannot be ascribed to such a motive, and must, on the contrary, be owing to their assurance in respect to the soundness of a tradition, and to their thinking it enough that the circumstances of the case were generally known. Says ‘ash-Shumunni: ‘It may be that one has heard the tradition from several reliable authorities, on the word of that guarantee whom he names; so that he is content to mention the latter, without mentioning either one or all of the former, on account of that confidence in the matter with which the soundness of the tradition inspires him; which is like what the reporter does who lets a tradition go loose.’

“If it happens that there is disagreement among reporters, in respect either to a support or a text, in consequence of transposition, addition or curtailment, or substitution either of one reporter or of one text for another, or error as to the names belonging to the support, or as to the

* i. e. ‘Abū-Hanīfah.

† Probably Tākī ad-Dīn ‘ash-Shumunni, the teacher of ‘as-Suyūṭī in tradition, who died A. H. 872. See *Hājī Khalf. Lex.*, iv. 59, and vii. 614.

‡ A traditionist of Kāfah. He died A. H. 189. See *Kitāb Tab.*, vi. 53.

§ An eminent traditionist and jurist of Baṣrah, who died A. H. 160. See *Kitāb Tab.*, v. 28.

parts of which the text consists, whether owing to compression, omission, or the like, the tradition becomes unstable (مُضطَّب). In case any one form of the tradition can be agreed upon, under such circumstances, it is well; otherwise, the tradition is stopped.

“If a reporter has interwoven a remark of his own, or of some witness of the Prophet, or follower in the second degree—designed, for instance, for some such purpose as to explain the common meanings of words, or to interpret the sense, or to limit a general expression, or the like—the tradition becomes involved (مُلْجَأ).

“*Section of a Warning.*

“The topic last suggested leads us to speak, also, of the reporting of a tradition, and its transmission, by the sense. In regard to this, there is difference of opinion. The great majority of persons think it allowable on the part of one so conversant with the Arabic language, skilled in the modes of discourse, and acquainted with the niceties of composition and the implied meanings of language, that he is not subject to err, either by adding to or taking from the sense. Others say that it is allowable as respects single words, not as respects phrases. Again, it is said by some to be allowable for one who recalls the words of the tradition, so that he is able to use discretion in the matter. It is also said that necessity in respect to making out judicial decisions renders it allowable for one who remembers the sentiments of tradition, but has forgotten the words in which they are expressed; while, on the other hand, one who remembers the words is not to be allowed to report by the sense, because there is no necessity. But does not all this difference of opinion respecting its admissibility and its inadmissibility amount to the principle that to report in the very words, without using any liberty, is the more proper way? Accordingly, on account of a saying of the Prophet . . . ‘God will assuredly cheer the face of him who hears my sentences, and retains them in memory, and recites them in the very words of tradition which he has heard,’ it is so agreed. Yet transmission by the sense occurs in the Six Books, as well as in other works.

“The term **المعنى** signifies the reporting of tradition by the expression: ‘On the authority of such a one, on the authority of such a one,’ and what is called tradition on authority (**المعنى**) is that which is reported in this form. Muslim makes it a condition of reporting by the expression mentioned, that the two persons thus named were contemporaneous: ‘al-Bukhāri requires that they have met; and others say that one must have taken the tradition from the other; but Muslim is strenuous and persistent in rejecting the views of the two latter parties. The reporting by this expression of a tradition also disguised is inadmissible.

“Every tradition carried back to the Prophet, of which the support is continuous, is sustained (**عِصْمَة**): this is universally acknowledged and held to. But some persons call every continuous tradition sus-

tained, although it be stopped, or fall short of the Prophet; and some call a tradition sustained which is carried back, even though it be loosened, or straitened, or dissevered."

Certain other technical distinctions, by which the weight of a tradition is affected, involving comparison between one tradition and another, in respect either to the text or the support, are presented in the following section, which is a continuation of the passage last cited from H. :*

فصل

ومن اقسام الحديث الشاذ والمنكر والمعلم والشاذ في اللغة من تفرد من الجماعة وخرج منها وفي الاصطلاح ما روى مخالف لما رواه الثقات فان لم يكن رواه ثقة فهو مردود وان كان ثقة فسبيله الترجيح بغير حفظ وضبط او كثرة عدد وجوه اخر من الترجيحات فالراجح يسمى محفوظا والمرجوح شاذا والمنكر حديث رواه ضعيف مخالف من هو اضعف منه ومقابلة المعروف والمنكر والمعروف كلا راوياهما ضعيف واحداها اضعف من الآخر وفي الشاذ والمحفوظ قوى احداها اقوى من الآخر والشاذ والمنكر مرجوحان والمحفوظ والمعروف راجحان وبعضهم لم يشتربوا في الشاذ والمنكر قيد المخالفة لرواى اخر قويا كان او ضعيفا و قالوا الشاذ ما رواه الثقة وتفرد به ولا يوجد له اصل موافق ومعاكس له وهذا صادق على فرد ثقة صحيح وبعضهم لم يعتبروا الثقة ولا المخالفة وكذلك المنكر لم يخصه بالصورة المذكورة وسموا حديث المطعون بفسق او غرط غفلة وكثرة غلط منكرا وهذا اصطلاحات لا مشاحة فيها والمعلم بفتح اللام اسناد فيه علل واسباب غامضة خفيفة قدحنة في الصحة يتتبه لها المذاق المهرة من اهل هذا الشان كارسال في الموصول ووقف في المرفع ونحو ذلك وقد يقتصر عبارة المعلم بكسر اللام عن اقامة الحجة على دعواه كائصيرفي في نقد الدينار والدرهم وانما روى احاديثنا وروى اخر حديثا موافقا له يسمى هذا للحديث متابعا بصيغة اسم الفاعل وهذا معنى ما يقول المحدثون تابعه فلان وكثيرا ما يقول البخاري في صحيحه ويقولون له متابعته ومتابعة توجب النقوية والتأييد ولا يلزم ان يكون المتابع مساويا في المرتبة للاصل وان كان دونه يصلح

* fol. 2, rect.

للمنتابعة والمنتابعة قد تكون في نفس المراوى وقد تكون في شبيهة فوقه والاول انتم واكملا من الثاني لأن الوهن في اول الاسناد اكثر واغلب والمنتابع اون وافق الاصل في اللفظ والمعنى يقال مثاله اون وافق في المعنى دون اللفظ يقال نحوه ويشترط في المنتابعة ان يكون الحديثان من صحابي واحد اون كانوا من صحابيين يقال له شاهد كما يقال له شاهد من حديث ابى هريرة ويقال له شهود ويشهد به حديث فلان وبعضهم يخسرون المنتابعة بالموافقة في اللفظ والشاهد في المعنى سواء كان من صحابي واحد او من صحابيين وقد يطلق الشاهد والمنتابع بمعنى واحد والامر في ذلك بين وتنبع طرق الحديث ولأسبابها لقصد معرفة المنتابع والشاهد يسمى الاعتبار

“Section.

“Other subdivisions of tradition are the separate (الشاذ), the undetermined (المنكر), and the specious (المعلل).

“The term الشاذ, in common parlance, signifies one who stands apart from the multitude, or comes out therefrom. In technical language, it denotes that which is reported at variance with the report of reliable authorities (النفقات). If, therefore, its reporters are not reliable, it is to be rejected; but, in case they are reliable, the method to be pursued in regard to it is to give the preference to whichever tradition has the greater degree of memory and retentiveness, or the larger number, on its side, or to choose between them according to other criteria of relative weight. That which preponderates, then, is called remembered tradition (محفوظ), and the one of inferior weight is called separate.

“Undetermined tradition is that which is reported by a weak reporter, at variance with one less weak than himself. Its correlate is recognized tradition (المعروف). Accordingly, both the undetermined and the recognized are reported by weak authorities, of whom one is weaker than the other; whereas the reporters of separate and of remembered tradition differ from each other in relative strength. Yet both the separate and the undetermined are overbalanced sorts of tradition, while the remembered and the recognized are two preponderating varieties. Some persons, however, do not make it a condition of separate and undetermined tradition, that one reporter differs to some extent from another, being either strong or weak, and say that the separate is that which a reliable authority reports alone, and for which is found no original that accords with it and gives it countenance; and that such tradition is trustworthy, inasmuch as it is upheld by a single sound reliable authority. Others, again, not taking into account either the existence of a reliable authority, or the fact of variance between two reporters, give a different definition of the undetermined from that

above stated, and call that tradition undetermined which comes from a reporter who is dishonored by some impiety, or by excess of carelessness and great blundering. The technical terms of which we here speak are used with freedom.

“Specious tradition (العمل)—the participle being pronounced with *fath* on the *lām*—is so named from the fact that certain hidden, subtle pretences and assumptions, injurious to its soundness, are involved in its support, which put upon their guard acute and skillful traditionists, in like manner as they are cautious of some loosening in the case of tradition [apparently] unbroken, and of some stoppage in that [which professes to be] carried back to the Prophet, and the like. The term is sufficiently explained by the use of **العمل**—with *kasr* on the *lām*—to signify the action of instituting a specious argument against one’s claim, after the manner of the money-changer who selects the better *dīnār*, or *dirham*.

“When one reporter has reported a tradition, and another reports a tradition answering thereto, the latter is called imitative tradition (متتابع) —the participle having the active form. This explains the saying of teachers of tradition: ‘Such a one imitates it;’ instead of which ‘al-Bukhārī and other teachers often use the expression: ‘There are imitations of it.’ Imitation serves for corroboration and helping out, though imitative tradition is not necessarily equal in grade to its original: it accords with the fact of imitation that it should be of inferior grade. A reporter may himself be imitated, or the imitation may be of a master above him in the chain of connection: the former case comes nearer to the ultimate aim and perfection of this sort of tradition than the latter, because the first part of a support is the most liable to be weak. If imitative tradition agrees with its original both in words and in meaning, it is said to be its like (مثل); if it agrees in meaning, but not in words, it is said to be its equivalent (سو). It is a condition of imitation, that both traditions be from one witness of the Prophet. In case they come from two witnesses, the imitated tradition is said to have testimony (شاهد) in its favor, as, for example, it is said: ‘It has testimony in its favor in the tradition of ‘Abū-Hurairah;’ another expression is: ‘It is testified to by so and so,’ or ‘The tradition of such a one bears testimony to it.’ Some persons, however, appropriate ‘imitation’ to an agreement in words, and use the term ‘attesting tradition’ (الشاعر) to signify accordance in meaning, whether the two traditions compared are from one witness of the Prophet or from two. Attesting tradition and the imitative are, indeed, loosely spoken of in one and the same sense; in which case the matter is to distinguish. To follow out the ways by which a tradition has come down, and the supports consisting thereof, in order to the recognition of imitative and attesting tradition, is called criticism (الاعتراض).”

The technical distinctions which have been stated and explained in these last extracts, together with the definitions pertaining to the qualifications of the responsible teacher, previously

given, lie at the foundation of the more comprehensive classification of tradition as sound, fair, and weak, which is itself recognized by the Muslims as the basis of all legal opinions derived from traditional sources. What then are sound, fair, and weak traditions? The following explanations from H. afford an answer to this inquiry:*

فصل

وأصل اقسام الحديث ثلاثة صحيح وحسن وضعييف فالصحيح اعلا مرتبة
والضعييف ادنى والحسن متوسط وساير الاقسام التي ذكرت داخلة في هذه
الثلاثة فالصحيح ما يثبت بنقل عدل تام الصبط غير معلل ولا شاذ فان
كانت هذه الصفات على وجه الكمال والتمام فهو الصحيح لذاته وان كان
فيه نوع قصور ووجد ما يحبو ذلك القصور من كثرة الطرق فهو الصحيح
لغيره وان لم يوجد فهو الحسن لذاته وما قد فيه الشريط المعتبرة في
الصحيح كلا او بعضا فهو الضعييف والضعييف ان تعدد طرقه والخبر ضعفة
يسعى حسنا لغيره وظاهر كلامهم انه ياجوز ان يكون جميع الصفات
المذكورة في الصحيح ناقصا في الحسن لكن التحقيق ان النقصان الذي
اعتبر في الحسن انما هو بخفة الصبط وباقى الصفات بحالها

فصل

الحديث الصحيح ان كان روبيه واحدا يسمى غريبا وان كان اثنين يسمى
عزيرا وان كانوا اكثر يسمى مشهورا ومستفيضا وان بلغت رواته في الاكثرة
الى ان يستحيل العادة تواطئهم على الكذب يسمى متواترا ويسعى
الغريب فردا ايضا والمراد بكونه روبيه واحدا كونه كذلك ولو في موضع
واحد من الاسناد لكنه يسمى فردا نسبيا وان كان في كل موضع منه يسمى
فردا مطلقا والمراد بكونهما اثنين ان يكونوا في كل موضع كذلك فان كان
في موضع واحد مثلا لم يكن الحديث عزيرا بل غريبا وعلى هذا القياس
معنى اعتبار الاكثرة في المشهور ان يكون في كل موضع اكثر من اثنين وهذا
معنى قولهم ان الاقل حاكم على الاكثرة في هذا الفن فافهم وعلم ما ذكر
ان الغرابة لا تناهى الصحة ويجوز ان يكون الحديث صحجا غريبا بان
يكون كل واحد من رجاله ثقة والغريب قد يقع بمعنى الشاذ اي شذوذا

* fol. 2, rect., and fol. 3, rect.

هو من اقسام الطعن في الحديث وهذا هو المراد من قول صاحب المصايبع من قوله هذا حديث غريب لما قال بطريق الطعن وبعض الناس يفسرون الشاذ بغير شاذ فالشذوذ بهذا المعنى أيضا لا ينافي الصحة كالغرابة والذى يذكر في مقام الطعن هو مخالفة الثقات

فصل

لل الحديث الضعيف هو الذي فقد فيه الشريوط المعتبرة في الصحة والحسن كلا او بعضا ويتسم راويه بشذوذ او نكارة او علة وبهذا الاعتبار يتعدد اقسامه الضعيف ويكثر افرادا وتركيبا ومراتب الصحيح والحسن لذاتهما ولغيرها ايضا ينقاو اراتب والدرجات في كمال الصفات المعتبرة المأكولة في مفهوميهما مع وجود الاشتراك في اصل الصحة والحسن والقوم صدطوا اراتب الصحة وعينوها وذكروا امثالها من الاسانيد وقلوا اسم العدالة والصبط يشتمل رجالها كلها ولكن بعضها فوق بعض واما اطلاق اصحاب الاسانيد على سند مخصوص على الاطلاق ففيه اختلاف فقال بعضهم اصحاب الاسانيد زين العابدين عن ابيه عن جده وقيل مالك عن نافع عن ابن عمر وقيل الزهرى عن سالم عن ابن عمر والحق ان الحكم على اسناد مخصوص بالاصحية على الاطلاق غير جائز الا ان في الصحة مرتب عليا وعدة من الاسانيد يدخل فيها ولو قيد بقيد بان يقال اصحاب اسانيد البلد الغلاني او في الباب الغلاني او في المسيلة الغلانية يصح والله اعلم

فصل

من عادة الترمذى ان يقول في جامعه حديث حسن صحيح حديث غريب حسن حديث حسن غريب صحيح ولا شبهة في جواز اجتماع الحسن والصحة بان يكون حسنا لذاته وحججا لغيره وكذلك في اجتماع الغرابة والصحة كما اسلفنا واما اجتماع الغرابة والحسن فيستشكلونه بان الترمذى اعتبر في الحسن تعدد الطرق فكيف يكون غريبا وجيبيون بان اعتبار تعدد الطرق في الحسن ليس على الاطلاق بل في قسم منه وحيث حكم باجتماع الحسن والغرابة المراد قسم اخر وقال بعضهم انه اشار بذلك الى اختلاف الطرق بان جاء في بعض الطرق غريبا وفي بعضها حسنا وقيل

اللواه يعني او بأنه يشكك ويتزدد في أنه غريب او حسن لعدم معرفته جزماً
وقيل المراد بالحسن هنا ليس معناه الاصطلاحى بل اللغوى بمعنى ما يميل
إليه الطبيع وهذا القول بعيد جداً

فصل

الاحتياج في الأحكام بالخبر الصحيح مجمع عليه وكذلك بالحسن لذاته
عند عامة العلماء وهو ملحق بالصحيح في باب الاحتياج وإن كان دونه
في المرتبة والحديث الضعيف الذي بلغ بتنوعه الطرق مرتبة الحسن لغيره
أيضاً مجتمع وما اشتهر أن الحديث الضعيف معتبر في فضائل الاعمال لا
في غيرها المراد مفرداته لا مجتمعها لانه داخل في الحسن لا في الضعيف
صرح به الآية وقال بعضهم أن كان الضعيف من جهة سوء حفظ أو اختلاط
أو تدليس مع وجود الصدق والديانة بينما ينجز بتنوعه الطرق وإن كان من
جهة اتهام الكذب أو الشذوذ أو فحش الخطأ لا ينجز بتنوعه الطرق
والحديث محكم عليه بالضعف ومحول به في فضائل الاعمال وعلى مثل
هذا ينبغي أن يحمل ما قبل حرف الضعيف بالصحيح لا يفسد قوته ولا
فهذا القول ظاهر الفساد فتتذر

“Section.

“Traditions are generically distinguished as sound (صحيح), fair (حسن), and weak (ضعيف).

“Sound tradition is the highest in grade, the weak is the lowest, and the fair stands mid-way; and all the above mentioned subdivisions are comprehended under these three denominations.

“Now then, that tradition which is established by the transmission of an upright and perfectly retentive reporter, and which is not specious, nor separate, is sound. If it have all these qualities in completeness, it is intrinsically sound (الصحيح لذاته); but, if some sort of deficiency pertains to it, and this deficiency is found to be made up by multiplicity of ways in which the tradition has come down, then it is extrinsically sound (الصحيح لغيره). If its deficiency is not made up, it becomes intrinsically fair (الحسن لذاته). That tradition in which either all or some of the conditions noted as belonging to the sound are wanting, is weak. If a weak tradition has come down by a number of different ways, and its internal character is that which constitutes its weakness, it is called extrinsically fair (حسن لغيره). There is a way of talking which plainly implies that all the qualities above named as belonging to sound tradition may be deficient in the fair: the truth, however, is that the deficiency made account of in fair tra-

tion consists only in a want of weight of retentiveness on the part of its reporters, while all the other qualities of the sound remain intact.

“Section.

“Sound tradition reported by one reporter is called unrelated tradition (غريب) ; if it come from two reporters, it is called rare tradition (غريب) ; if its reporters are more in number, it is called notorious (مشهور) or wide-spread (مستفيض) tradition ; if its reporters are so numerous that the supposition of an agreement to deceive is made absurd by the habitual repetition of it, it is called reiterated tradition (متواتر).

“Unrelated tradition is also called unique (فرد), and what is meant by its being reported by one reporter is that it stands thus by itself : if, indeed, this is true of it as regards only one link in the support, it is called relatively unique (فرد نسبي) ; but if as regards every link pertaining thereto, it is called absolutely unique (فرد مطلق). The meaning of a tradition’s being from two reporters is that it has two reporters at each link in its support : should this be true of it at only one point, the tradition is not rare, but unrelated. Multiplicity of reporters, as made account of in the case of notorious tradition, is to be understood after this analogy, to mean that there are more than two at each link in the support. Such is the signification of the common saying that the less overrules the more in respect to this species. Be, therefore, wary.

“From what has been said one may know that the fact of a tradition being unrelated is not inconsistent with soundness, and that it is sound without affinity (صحيحة غريب), provided each of the guarantees making up its line of descent be a reliable authority. The term ‘unrelated’ is also used as synonymous with ‘separate,’ that is, separate by a want of analogy which constitutes one of the forms in which tradition is dishonored : such is the meaning of a remark made by the author of the *Masâbih*,* namely : ‘As stated by him, this tradition is unrelated,’ for he would intimate that the tradition is dishonored. Some persons, however, as before said, explain the term ‘separate’ to mean tradition which has but one reporter, whether he be at variance with reliable authorities or not, and say : ‘sound and separate,’ or ‘sound not separate :’ in this sense, separateness, being nothing more than the fact that a tradition is unrelated, is not inconsistent with soundness. But that separateness which is intended to attach dishonor to a tradition, must be variance from reliable authorities.

“Section.

“Weak tradition is that in which either all or some of the conditions considered as requisite to soundness and fairness are wanting—of which, therefore, the reporter is marked by something of separateness, inde-

* i. e. *Masâbih 'as-Sunnah*, a collection of traditions made by 'al-Baghawî, who died A. H. 516. The *Mishkât 'al-Masâbih* mentioned in our introductory remarks is a recension of this work. See *Hâji Khalf. Lex.*, v. 564, ff.

terminateness, or speciousness. This definition is, in effect, an enumeration of the subdivisions of weak tradition. It is more or less weak according as its characteristics exist singly or in combination.

“The degrees of sound and fair tradition, also—including both the intrinsically and the extrinsically sound and fair—vary according to the gradations and measures therein existing of completeness in respect to the qualities noted and assumed as belonging to the conception of the two respectively, there being in all a participation in the fundamental quality of soundness or fairness. Certain persons have noted down and distinguished the several degrees of soundness, and cited supports exemplifying them; and it is their declaration that uprightness and retentiveness are qualities possessed in common by all guarantees constituting supports of that character, though some such supports take precedence over others.

“With regard to what particular support should be viewed as absolutely the soundest, there is difference of opinion. Some say that the soundest of all supports is: ‘Zain ‘al-‘Abidîn, on the authority of his father, on the authority of his grandfather;’ others that it is: ‘Mâlik, on the authority of ‘Ibn ‘Umar;’ others again give the preëminence to: ‘‘Az-Zuhri, on the authority of Sâlim, on the authority of ‘Ibn ‘Umar.’ But the truth is that to attribute to any particular support the quality of preëminent soundness, absolutely, is not allowable: we can only distinguish higher degrees of soundness from those which are lower, and a number of representative supports, taken together, from certain others. If a limitation is indicated, by saying that such is ‘the soundest tradition of the country so and so’ (or, ‘under such a head,’ or, ‘on such a topic,’) it is all right—God knows.

“Section.

“Among the expressions habitually used by ‘at-Tarmidhî in his *Jâmi*’, are the following: ‘a fair and sound tradition,’ ‘an unrelated and fair tradition,’ and ‘a fair, unrelated and sound tradition.’ Now, there is no doubt that, inasmuch as a tradition may be fair, as viewed by itself, and at the same time sound, taken in connection with other traditions, fairness and soundness may be combined; so, too, the quality of being unrelated is compatible with soundness, as we have already stated. But the combination with fairness of the quality of being unrelated is found difficult to be understood, since ‘at-Tarmidhî considered multiplicity of ways of descent to be a characteristic of fair tradition; for how, then, can fair tradition be unrelated? To this it is replied, that the consideration of multiplicity of ways of descent as a characteristic of fair tradition is not absolute, but has reference to one subdivision of it, and that, wherever tradition is represented as combining fairness with the quality of being unrelated, another subdivision of fair tradition must be intended. Some persons, however, say that the author makes allusion, in that expression, to the descent of a tradition by various ways, it having come down unrelated by one way, and fair by another. It is also said that the conjunction *و* [in the expression “unrelated and fair”] may be interpreted as equivalent to *كذلك*, denoting a doubt and indecision whether the tradition was unrelated, or fair, from the

want of definite knowledge. Another suggestion is that 'fair,' in the case referred to, has not its technical meaning, but its signification as used in common parlance, denoting that by which man is naturally attracted—which is very far-fetched.

“Section.

“It is universally agreed that, in judicial decisions, one may argue from a traditional statement (الخبر) which is sound; and most of the doctors allow of arguing, in like manner, from one which is intrinsically fair, and such tradition is actually coupled with the sound in argumentation, although its grade is inferior. Such weak tradition, also, as attains, by multiplicity of ways of descent, to the rank of extraneously fair, is used together with the other sorts. The widely received opinion that weak tradition is to be taken into account on the subject of the active virtues, though not on any other topic—meaning single traditions of this sort, not a combination of several, for otherwise they should be called fair, and not weak—is distinctly expressed by eminent teachers: and some of them say that, if a tradition is weak on account of defective memory, or confusion, or disguising, while yet the reporter was truthful and religious, it may be elevated in rank by multiplicity of ways of descent; but that, if it is weak on account of a falsifying indulgence of fancy, or separateness, or blamable error, it is not elevated by multiplicity of ways of descent, and is judged to be weak, and treated accordingly, even on the subject of the active virtues. Agreeably to some such explanation must, also, be understood the saying that the coupling of the weak with the weak hinders not force; otherwise, this saying is manifestly incorrect. Proceed, therefore, with care.”

Another statement of the distinctive peculiarities of sound, fair, and weak tradition, as well as of the subordinate varieties included in each of these leading divisions, is presented in one of the chapters of J., which we here give entire, as follows:*

الباب الاول

في اقسام الحديث وانواعه وفيه ثلاثة فصول

الفصل الاول

في الصراحت

هو ما اتصل سنته بنقل العدل الصابط عن منهله وسلم عن شذوذ وعلة ونعني بالمتصل ما لم يكن مقطوعاً باى وجہ كان وبالعدل من لم يكن مستور العدالة ولا مجرىحا وبالصابط من يكون حافظاً منبيقظاً وبالشذوذ ما يرويه الشفقة مخالف لرواية الناس وبالعلة ما فيه اسباب خفية خامضة قادحة وتنتفاوت

* pages 1-5.

درجات الصحيح بحسب قوة شرطه وضعفها وأول من صنف في الصحيح المجدد الإمام البخاري ثم مسلم وكتابهما أصح الكتب بعد كتاب الله العزيز وأما قول الشافعى رح ما أعلم شيئاً بعد كتاب الله أصح من موطاً مالك فقبل وجود الكتابين وأعلى اقسام الصحيح ما اتفقا عليه ثم ما انفرد به البخارى ثم ما انفرد به مسلم ثم ما كان على شرطهما وإن لم يخرجاه ثم على شرط البخارى ثم على شرط مسلم ثم ما صحّه غيرهما من الآية فهذه سبعة اقسام وما حذف سنه فيهما وهو كثير في تراجم البخارى قليل جداً في كتاب مسلم فما كان منه بصيغة الجزم نحو قال فلان فعل وامر وروى وذكر معروفاً فهو حكم بصحته وما روى من ذلك مجھولاً فليس حكم بصحته ولكن ايراده في كتاب الصحيح مشعر بصحة اصله وأما قول الحاكم اختيار البخارى ومسلم ان لا يذكرا في كتابيهما الا ما رواه الصحابي المشهور عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وله روايان ثقتنان فاكثر ثم يرويه عنه تابعى مشهور وله ايضاً روايان ثقتنان فاكثر ثم كذلك في كل درجة فيه بحث قال الشیخ محيى الدين النووي رح ليس ذلك من شرطهما لآخر جهه احاديث ليس لها الا اسناد واحد منها حديث ائم الاعمال بالنبیات ونظائره في الصحيحين كثيرة قال ابن حیان تفرد بحديث ائم الاعمال اهل المدينة وليس هو عند اهل العراق ولا عند اهل مكة والیمن ولا الشام ومصر وروایه هو بھی بن سعید القطان عن محمد بن ابراهیم عن علقة عن عمر بن الخطاب رضه هكذا رواه البخاری ومسلم وابو داود والترمذی والنمسائی وابن ماجة مع اختلاف في الرواية بعد بھی يعرف بالرجوع الى هذه الصحا

الفصل الثاني

في الحسن

الترمذی هو ما لا يكون في اسناده منهم ولا يكون شاذًا وبروى من غير وجه نحو الخطابي ما عرف مخرجه وأشهور رجاله وعليه مدار اکثر الحديث فالمقطوع ونحوه ما لم يعرف مخرجه وكذا المدلس اذا لم يبين بعض المتأخرین هو الذي فيه ضعف قریب محتمل وبصلاح للعمل به ابن الصلاح هو قسمان أحدهما ما لم يدخل رجال اسناده عن مستور غير مغفل في روایة وقد روى مثلاً او نحوه من وجه آخر والثاني ما اشتهر راویه بالصدق والامانة وقمر

عن درجة رجال الصحيح حفظاً واتقاناً بحيث لا يعده ما انفرد به منكراً ولا بد في القسمين من سلامتهما عن الشذوذ والتعليل قبل ما ذكره بعض المتأخررين بني على أن معرفة الحسن موقوفة على معرفة الصحيح والضعيف لانه وسط بينهما قوله قریب ای قریب مخرجہ الى الصحيح محتمل كذبه تكون رجاله مستورين والفرق بين حدى الصحيح والحسن ان شرایط الصحيح معتبرة في حد للحسن لكن العدالة في الصحيح ينبغي ان يكون ظاهرة والاتقان كاملاً وليس ذلك شرطاً في الحسن ومن ثم احتاج الى قيد قولنا ان يروى من غير وجه مثلك او نحوه ليناجبر به فالضعيف هو الذي بعد عن نخرج الصحيح مخرجہ واحتتمل الصدق والكذب او لا يحتمل الصدق اصلاً كالموضوع وانما سمى حسناً لحسن الظن براویہ ولو قيد الحسن هو مسند من قرب من درجة الثقة او مرسل ثقة وروى كلاماً من غير وجه وسلم عن شذوذ وعلة لكان اجمع المحدود واضبطها وابعدها عن التعقيد ونعني بالمسند ما اتصل اسناده الى منتهاه وبالثقة من جمع بين العدالة والضبط والتنكير في ثقة للشیعه كما سیاتی بیانه في نوع المرسل والحسن حجة كالصحيح ولذلك ادرج في الصحيح قال ابن الصلاح تسمیة حیی السنّة في المصابیح السنن بالحسان تساعد لان فيها الصلاح والحسان والضعاف وقول الترمذی حديث حسن صحيح بیرید به انه روى باسنادين احدیماً يقتضی الصاححة والآخر الحسن او المراد اللغوى وهو ما تقبل البه النفس و تستحسنه والحسن اذا روى من وجه اخر ترقى من الحسن الى الصحيح لقوته من للهیین فيعتقد احدهما بالآخر ونعني بالترقی انه ملحق في القوة بالصحيح لا انه عینه واما الضعيف فلکذب راویہ وفسقه لا يناجب بـتعدد طریقه كما في حديث طلب العلم فـریضـة قال البیهـقـی هذا حـدـیـث مشهـور، بـین النـاسـ، وـاـسـنـادـ ضـعـیـفـ وـقـدـ رـوـیـ منـ اـوـجـهـ کـثـیرـ کـلـهاـ ضـعـیـفـ

الفصل الثالث

في الضعيف

هو ما لم يجتمع فيه شروط الصالحة والحسن ويتناول درجاته في الضعف
بحسب بعده من شروط الصالحة والحسن وتجوز عند العلماء التناول في
اسانيد الضعيف دون الموضع من غير بيان ضعفه في الموضع والقصد

وفصايل الاعمال لا في صفات الله تعالى واحكام المحلل والمحلمن قبيل كان من مذهب النسائي ان يخرج عن كل من لم ياجمع على ترك له وابو داود كان يأخذ مأخذ ويبخرج الضعيف اذا لم يجد في الباب غيره ويرجحه على رأي الرجال وعن الشعبي ما حدثك عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم هؤلاء فخذ به وما قالوا برأيهم فائقة في الحش وقال الرأى منزلة الميتة اذا اضطررت اليها اكلتها وعن الشافعى رح مهما قلت من قول او اصلت من اصل فيه عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خلاف ما قلت فالقول ما قاله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو قوله وجعل بيرده وھنها عدة عبارات منها ما يشتراك فيه الاقسام الثلاثة اعني الصحيح والحسن والضعف ومنها ما يختص بالضعف

فمن الاول المسند هو ما اتصل سند مرفوعا الى رسول الله صلى عليه وسلم والمتصل هو ما اتصل سند سواء كان مرفوعا اليه صلى الله عليه وسلم او موقوفا والمفوع هو ما اضيف الى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خاصة من قول او فعل او تقرير سواء كان متصل او منقطعا فالمتصل قد يكون مرفوعا وغير مرفوع والمفوع قد يكون متصلة وغير متصل والممسن متصل مرفوع والمعنى هو ما يقال في سند فلان عن فلان والصحيح انه متصل اذا امكن اللقاء مع البراءة من التدليس وقد ادوع في الصحيحين قال ابن الصلاح كثرة في عصرنا وما قاربه استعمال عن في الاجازة اذا قبيل فلان عن رجل عن فلان فالاقرب انه منقطع وليس بمسند والتعليق ما حذف من مبادئ اسناد واحد فاكثر ما يخوض من تعليق الجدار والطلان لاشتراكهما في قطع الاتصال فالحذف ما ان يكون في اول الاسناد وهو المعلق او وسطه وهو المنقطع او في اخره وهو المرسل والبخاري اكثر من هذا النوع في صحيحه وليس بخارج من الصحيح لكون الحديث معروفا من جهة النقاد الذين علق عنهم او لكونه ذكرة متصلة في موضع اخر من كتابه والآثار اما فرد عن جميع الرواية او من جهة نحو تفرد به اهل مكة فلا يضعف الا ان يبرد به تفرد واحد منهم والمدرج هو ما ادرج في الحديث من كلام بعض الرواية فيظن انه من الحديث او ادرج متنان بساندتين كرواية سعيد بن ابي مريم لا تبالغوا ولا تحسدوا ولا تندابروا ولا تنافسوا ادرج ابن ابي مريم فيه ولا

تنافسوا من متن اخر او عند الراوى طرف من متن واحد بسند شيخ هو غير سند المتن فيرويهم عنده بسند واحد فيصير الاسناد اسنادا واحدا او يسمع حديثا واحدا من جماعة مختلفين في سنته او متنه فيدرج روايته على الاختلاف وتعدد كل واحد من الثلاثة حرام والمشهور ما شاع عند اهل الحديث خاصة بان نقله رواة كثيرون نحو ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قنت شهرها يدعوا على جماعة او اشتهر عندهم وعنده غيرهم نحو انما الاعمال بالنبيات او عند غيرهم خاصة قال الامام احمد قوله للسأييل حق وان جاء على فرس ويوم حركم يوم صومكم يدوران في الاسواق ولا اصل لها في الاعتبار والغريب والعزيز قبيل الغريب ك الحديث التزهري واشباهه من جمع حديثه لعدة النساء وضبطه اذا تفرد عنهم بالحديث رجل يسمى غريبا فان رواه عنهم اثنان او ثلاثة يسمى عزيزا وان رواه جماعة يسمى مشهورا والافراد المضافة الى البلدان ليست بغريب والغريب اما صحيح كالافراد المخرجية في الصحيح او غير صحيح وهو الاعلب واحد اسنادا لا متنا ك الحديث يعرف متنه عن جماعة من الصحابة اذا تفرد بروايتها واحد عن صحيح اخر ومنه قول الترمذى غريب من هذا الوجه ولا يوجد ما هو غريب متننا لا اسنادا الا اذا اشتهر الحديث الفرد فرواه عنمن تفرد به جماعة كثيرة فانه يصير غريبا مشهورا واما الحديث انما الاعمال بالنبيات فان اسناده متصرف بالغرابة في طرفة الاول متصرف بالشهرة في طرفة الاخر والمصحف قد يكون في الراوى ك الحديث شعبة عن العوام بن مراجم بالراء والجيم صحفه يحيى بن معين فقال مزاحم بالزاي والخاء المهملة وقد يكون في الحديث ك قوله صلى الله عليه وسلم من صام رمضان واتبعه ستة من شوال صحفه بعضهم فقال شيئاً بالشين المعجمة والمسلسل هو ما تتتابع فيه رجال الاسناد الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عند روايته على حالة واحدة اما في الراوى قوله نحو سمعت فلانا يقول سمعت فلانا الى المنتهى او اخبرنا فلان والله قال اخبرنا فلان والله الى المنتهى او فعلا ك الحديث التشبيك بالبيك او قوله وفعلا كما في الحديث اللهم اعني على ذكرك وشكرك وحسن عبادتك وفي رواية ابي داود واحمد والنسائي قال الراوى اخذ رسول الله صلى الله

عليه وسلم بيدي فقال انى لاحبك فقل اللهم اعني بالخ واما على صفة
كحديث الفقهاء فقيه عن فقيه المتباعين بال اختيار ما لم يتفرقوا واما في الرواية
كالمسلسل باتفاق اسماء الرؤا واسماء اباء ^{هم} او كنائهم او انسابهم او بلدانهم
قال الامام النووي وانا اروى ثلثة احاديث مسلسلة بالدمشقين والاعتبار

هو النظر في حال الحديث هل تفرد به راويه ام لا وهل هو معروف او لا
والضرب الثاني ما يختص بالضعيف الموقوف وهو مطلقا ما روى عن الصحابي
من قول او فعل متصلا كان او منقطعا وهو ليس بحاجة على الاصح وقد
يستعمل في غير الصحابي مقيدا نحو وفده معمر على ثام ووفده مالك على
نافع وقول صحابي كنا نفعلة في زمن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مرفوع لأن
الظاهر الاطلاع والتقدير وكذا كان اصحابه يقرعون بابه بالاظافير مرفوع في
المعنى وتفسير الصحابي موقوف وما كان من قبيل سبب النزول كقول جابر
كانت اليهود تقول كذا فائز الله سجنه وتعالى كذا ونحوه مرفوع المقطوع
ما جاء عن التابعين من اقوالهم وافعالهم موقوفا عليهم وليس بحاجة المرسل
قول التابع قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كذا او فعل كذا وهو المعروف
في الثقة واصوله وفيه خلاف وللشافعى رح تفصيل مذكور في اصول الفقه
المنقطع ما لم يتصل اسناده باى وجه كان سواء ترك ذكر الراوى من اول
الاسناد او وسطه او اخره الا ان الغالب استعماله في من دون التابع عن
الصحابي كمالك عن ابن عمر المعرض بفتح الصاد وهو ما سقط من سنته
اثنان فصاعدا كقول مالك قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقول الشافعى
قال ابن عمرو كذا الشاذ والمنكر الشافعى رحمة الله الشاذ ما رواه الثقة مخالف
لما رواه الناس قال ابن الصلاح فيه تفصيل فما خالف مفردة احفظ منه
واضبط فشاذ مردو وان لم يخالف احفظ منه وهو عدل ضابط فصحيح
وان رواه غير ضابط لكن لا يبعد عن درجة الضابط فحسن وان بعد فنكر
ويغىهم من قوله احفظ واصبض على صيغة التفصيل ان المخالف ان كان
مثلا لا يكون مردو وقد علم من هذا التقسيم ان المنكر ما هو المعلم
ما فيه اسباب خفية غامضة قادحة والظاهر السلامة ويستعمل على ادراكه
بتفرد الراوى مخالفة غيره له مع فرائين تنبه العارف على ارسال في الموصول
او وقف في المرفوع او دخول حديث في حديث او ^{هم} وام ^{هم} بحيث يغلب
على ظنه ذلك فيحكم به او يتعدد فيتوقف وكل ذلك مانع عن الحكم بصححة

ما وجد ذلك فيه وحديث يعلى بن عبيد عن الشورى عن عمرو بن دينار عن ابن عمر عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم البیغان بأخیار أسناده متصل عن العدل الصابط وهو معلم والمتن صحيح لأن عمرو بن دینار وضع موضع أخیه عبد الله بن دینار هكذا رواه الآية من اصحاب الشورى عنه فوهم يعلى وقد يطلق اسم العلة على الكذب والغفلة وسوء الحفظ ونحوها وبعضهم أطلقه على مخالفة لا يقدح كراسل ما وصله النقا الصابط حتى قال من الصحيح ما هو صحيح. معلم كما قال آخر من الصحيح ما هو صحيح شاذ ويدخل في هذا حديث يعلى بن عبيد البیغان بأخیار المدلس ما أخفى عبيه أما في الأسناد وهو أن يروى عن نقيه أو عاصره ما لم يسمعه منه على سبيل يوم أنه سمعه منه فن حقه أن لا يقول حدثنا بل يقول قال فلان أو عن فلان ونحوه دربما لم يسقط المدلس شيخه لكن يسقط من بعده رجلا ضعيفا أو صغير السن يحسن الحديث بذلك كفعل الأعمش والثورى وغيرهما وهو مكرر جدا ونمه أكثر العلماء واختلف في قبول روایته والاصح التفصیل فما رواه بلفظ محتمل لم يبين فيه السماح فحكمه حکم المرسل وأنواعه وما رواه بلفظ مبين للاتصال كسمعت وأخبرنا وحدثنا وآشیاهها فهو محتاج به وأما في الشیوخ وهو أن يروى عن شیوخ حديثا سمعه فيسميه أو يکنیه أو ينسبة أو يصفه بما لا يعرف به كيلا يعرف وامر اخف لكن فيه تصبیع للمروى عنه وتوغیر بطريق معرفة حالي والکراهة بحسب الغرض للحامل عليه نحو أن يكون کثیر الروایة عنه فلا يجب الاكثر من واحد على صورة واحدة وقد يحمله عليه کون شیخه الذى غير سنته غير ثقة أو اصغر منه أو غير ذلك المضطرب ما اختلفت الروایة فيه فما اختلفت الروایتان ان ترجحت احديهما على الاخرى بوجه نحو أن يكون راویهما احفظ وأكثر حکمة للمروى عنه فالحكم للراجح فلا يكون حبیئذ مضطرب ولا مضطرب المقلوب هو نحو حديث مشهور عن سالم جعل عن نافع ليصيير بذلك غریبا مرغوبا فيه وحديث البخاری حين قدم بغداد وامتحان الشیوخ ایاه بقلب الاسانید مشهور الموضع الخبر اما ان يجب تصدیقه وهو ما نص الآیة على صحته واما ان يجب تکذیبه وهو ما نصوا على وضنه او يتوقف فيه لاحتمال الصدق والکذب كسائر الاخبار ولا بحل

رواية الموضوع للعالم بحالة في أي معنى كان لا مقوونا ببيان الموضوع ويعرف باقرار واضعه او ركاكه الفاظه او بالوقوف على غلط كما وقع لثابت ابن موسى الزاهد في حديث من كثرت صلوته بالليل حسن وجهه بالنهار قبيل كان شيخ بحدث في جماعة فدخل رجل حسن الوجه فقال الشیخ في اثناء حديثه من كثرت النغ فوقع لثابت انه من الحديث فروا و الواضعون للحديث اصناف واعظمهم ضررا من انتسب الى الوهد فوضع احتسابا ووضع التقادة ايضا جملما ثم نهضت جهليذة الحديث بكشف عوارها ومحو عارها والحمد لله وقد ذهبت الهرامية والطایفة المبتدعة الى جواز وضع الحديث في الترغيب والترهيب ومنه ما روى عن ابي عصمة نوح ابن مريم انه قبيل له من ابين لك عن عكرمة عن ابن عباس في فضائل القرآن سورة سورة فقال اني رأيت الناس قد اعرضوا عن القرآن واشتغلوا بفقه ابي حنيفة ومجازى محمد بن اسحاق فوضعت هذه الاحاديث حسبة وقد اخطأ المفسرون في ايداعها في تفاسيرهم الا من عصمه الله وما اودعوا فيها انه قال صلي الله عليه وسلم حين فرأى ومناة الثالثة الاخري تلك الغرائيف العلى وان شفاعتهن لنترجح ولقد اشبعنا القول في ابطاله في باب سجده التلاوة وكذا ما اوزره الاصوليون من قوله اذا روى عن حديث فاعرضوه على كتاب الله فان وافقه فاقلبه وان خالفه فردو قال للخطابي وضعته التقادة ويدفعه قوله من اني قد اوتتني الكتاب وما يعدله وبروى اوتتني الكتاب ومتله معه وقد صنف ابن الجوزي في الموضوعات مجلدات قال ابن الصلاح اودع فيها كثيرا من الاحاديث الضعيفة ما لا دليل على وضعه وحقها ان يذكر في الاحاديث الضعيفة وللشيخ الحسن بن محمد الصغاني الدر المنشط في تبيان الغلط

“CHAPTER FIRST.

“*Kinds and Species of Tradition, in Three Sections.*

“*SECTION FIRST.*

“*Sound Tradition.*

“This is that of which the support is continuous, by the transmission of an upright and retentive reporter, on the authority of his like, and which is free from separateness and speciousness. We mean by ‘continuous’ that which is not, in any manner whatever, interrupted (مقطوع) ;

by 'upright,' one whose uprightness is neither doubtful nor dishonored; by 'retentive,' one who is vigilant to remember; our use of 'separateness' refers to that which a reliable authority reports at variance with the general report; and under 'speciousness' we allude to tradition in which certain hidden, subtle assumptions, injurious to its character, are involved. The degrees of sound tradition differ from one another in proportion to the strength or weakness of its conditions. 'Al-Bukhārī was the first to compose a book of sound tradition alone; the next was Muslim; and their two books are the most perfect of all books after the Glorious Book of God: as for the saying of 'ash-Shāfi'i—to whom may God be merciful!—'I know of no book, after the Book of God, more perfect than the *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik,' that was said before the existence of the books of 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim. Now, the highest subdivision of sound tradition is that which these two authors agree in bringing forward; the next is that which 'al-Bukhārī alone presents; then comes that which Muslim alone presents; then that which accords with the conditioning of the two, although not given out by both; then that which is in accordance with what 'al-Bukhārī stipulates; then that which accords with what Muslim stipulates; and last, that which other eminent teachers regard as sound—in all, seven subdivisions.

"With respect to traditions, found in the two books, of which the reports are abridged—numerous in the chapters of 'al-Bukhārī, and very few in Muslim's book—those of them which are given in an expressly concise form, for example: 'Such a one says' (or 'did,' or 'commands,' or 'reports,' or 'states,') '[so and so],' as being well known, are judged to be sound; but those which are given as if there were want of knowledge respecting them are not deemed sound, while yet their being brought forward in a book of sound tradition indicates the soundness of their originals.

"The saying of 'al-Hākim,[†] that 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim chose to state, in their books, only those traditions which are reported by some well known witness of the Prophet, on the authority of the Messenger of God . . . , and handed down by two reliable authorities, and so continued on; and which are also reported by some well known follower of the Prophet in the second degree, on the authority of a witness, and so continued on; and of which the like of this is true at each stage,' has been made the subject of dispute. The master Muhibb ad-dīn 'an-Nawawi[‡]—to whom may God be merciful!—denies that such stipulations were made by the two authors, because they actually give out traditions with only one support, as, for example, the tradition: 'Ac-

* The *Muwaṭṭa'* of Mālik Bin 'Anas is by some Arab authors supposed to have been the earliest book composed by a Muslim. Others give the preéminence to a collection of traditions made by 'Ibn Juraij. See *Hāji Khalif. Lex.*, iii. 28.

† 'Abū-'Ahmad of Nisāpūr, surnamed the Great Judge ('al-Hākim 'al-Kabīr), who is said to have been "preéminent in knowledge of the conditions of sound tradition," died A. H. 378. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xii. 59.

‡ 'An-Nawawi of Damascus, the author of several useful works on tradition and jurisprudence, and among others of a commentary on Muslim's collection of traditions, which is frequently cited on the margin of the Dehli edition of this work, died A. H. 676. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xx. 3.

tions are only according to intentions,* of the like of which many are to be found in the two *Sahīhs*. 'Ibn Hibbān † says that the tradition: 'Actions are only according to intentions' belonged to the people of Madinah alone, and was not known among the inhabitants of 'Irāk, nor of Makkah, nor of Yaman, Syria, or Egypt, and that its reporter is Yahya Bin Sa'id 'al-Kattān, on the authority of Muhammad Bin 'Ibrāhīm, on the authority of 'Alkamah, on the authority of 'Umar Bin 'al-Khattāb—to whom may God be gracious!—and it is thus handed down by 'al-Bukhārī and Muslim, as well as by 'Abū-Dāwud, 'at-Tarmidhī, 'an-Nasā'i and 'Ibn Mājah, with some difference in respect to the reporters after Yahya, which may be ascertained by reference to the *Sahīhs* of these authors.

“SECTION SECOND.

“*Fair Tradition.*

“According to 'at-Tarmidhī, this is that of which the support includes no suspected reporter, and which is not separate, and is equivalently reported in some other form. According to 'al-Khattābī,† it is that given out by a recognized traditionist, of which the guarantees are persons of reputation, and which forms the centre of a cluster of traditions; and so dissevered tradition, and the like, in the view of this teacher, is that given out by some one not recognized, as also the disguised, in case there is no explanation of it. According to certain of the moderns, it is that in which there is something of weakness, and which, while almost up to the mark, may be regarded diversely, and is at the same time of a practical character. According to 'Ibn 'as-Ṣalāh,§ there are two subdivisions of it: first, that of which the support includes some guarantee who is questionable, though not convicted of

* This tradition, in the form “Actions are according to the intention,” is found in one of the chapters of the Book of the Faith of 'al-Bukhārī's *Sahīh*. The heading of the chapter is as follows:

باب ما جاءَ أَنَّ الْأَعْمَالَ بِالنِّيَّةِ وَلِلْحُسْنَةِ وَكُلُّ أَمْرٍ مَا نَوَى فَدَخَلَ فِيهِ الْأَيَّانَ
وَالْوُضُوءُ وَالصَّلَاةُ وَالزَّكَاةُ وَالحجُّ وَالصَّومُ وَالاَحْكَامُ وَقَالَ قُلْ كُلُّ يَعْمَلُ عَلَى شَاكِنَتِهِ
عَلَى نِيَّتِهِ وَنَفْقَةُ الرَّجُلِ عَلَى أَهْلِهِ يَحْتَسِبُهَا صَدَقَةً وَقَالَ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ
وَلَكُنْ جَهَادُ وَنِيَّةُ

“*Chapter of information that actions are according to the intention and purpose, and that every man is credited for that which he intends; so that intention comprehends both belief, purification, prayer, alms-giving, pilgrimage and fasting, and the subordinate requirements of law—as, indeed, it is said in the Kurān [xvii. 86] ‘Declare thou, that whoever performs required action in purpose, i. e. so far as intention goes, etc.; and man’s expenditure upon his people is there reckoned as alms-giving; and it was a saying of the Prophet: ‘... but a warring for the faith with an intention.’*” See MS., fol. 5, rect.

† 'Ibn Hibbān of Samarkand, who was not only a jurist and traditionist, but also an astronomer, physician, etc., died A. H. 354. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xii. 30.

‡ Of Sabtah in North-W. Africa: he died A. H. 388. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xiii. 20.

§ By birth a Kurd, who became one of the most distinguished of the interpreters of the Kurān, and the traditionists and jurists of his time: he died A. H. 643. See *Kitāb Tab.*, xvii. 21.

carelessness in any report, and which is reported in the same words, or equivalently, by another way of descent; and second, that reported by a man of reputation for truthfulness and trustiness, though, in respect to memory and confidence of knowledge, of a grade below the guarantees of sound tradition—so that it is not accounted as that sort of tradition received on a single authority, which is undetermined—and both subdivisions must necessarily be clear of separateness and speciousness. All these different views have been expressed.

“The foundation of the statement of certain of the moderns is the principle that a knowledge of fair tradition depends upon a knowledge of the sound and the weak, because it stands midway between the two; their expression ‘almost up to the mark,’ therefore, means that it is almost equal to sound tradition as regards the person who gives it out; and that it ‘may be regarded diversely’ signifies the possibility of its falsity, on account of the doubt which there is in respect to the character of its guarantees.

“The boundary-line between the sound and the fair is marked by the circumstance that, while the conditions of sound tradition are reckoned in for the definition of the fair, yet uprightness must be manifest, and confidence of knowledge perfect, for sound tradition—which is not essential for the fair; and hence arises the necessity of that requisition signified by the words above used: ‘reported, in the same words or equivalently, by another way of descent,’ in order that one tradition may make good the other. Weak tradition, then, is that which is brought out by a reporter widely differing in character from one who brings out sound tradition, and which may be either true or false, or cannot be supposed unconditionally true, as, for example, supposititious tradition. The name of ‘fair’ is given to tradition only on account of the fairness of the reputation of its reporter; and if one should say that fair tradition is that which is sustained, given out by a reporter nearly equal in grade to the reliable authority, or that which a reliable authority lets go loose, being in either case reported also by another way of descent, and free from all separateness and speciousness—that would be the most comprehensive and exact, and the least involved, definition: by the expression ‘sustained’ we mean that of which the support is continuous to its end; and by ‘the reliable authority,’ one who unites uprightness and retentiveness—we say, indefinitely, ‘a reliable authority’ [in the expression: ‘that which a reliable authority lets go loose’], because our meaning, which we shall explain under the head of loosened tradition, is too well known to need specification.

“Fair tradition is legal proof, like the sound, and, so far as that goes, is ranked with the latter: says *Ibn ‘as-Salâh*: ‘There is a lack of strictness in Muhibbî ‘as-sunnah’s designation of traditions as fair, in the *Mâṣâbih*, because among those so called are included both sound and weak.’ But ‘at-Tarmidhi’s expression: ‘a fair and sound tradition’ signifies that it is reported with two supports, of which the one makes it to have the quality of soundness, and the other that of fairness; or else the meaning of ‘fair’ is that recognized in common parlance, namely, something towards which man’s sensitive nature is attracted, and which it esteems.

“The reporting of a fair tradition by some other way of descent may elevate it from the rank of the fair to that of the sound, for its strength lies in both aspects of it, and so the one way of descent may be helped out by the other: we mean by ‘elevation’ (النَّرْفَى) that a tradition partakes of the strength of sound tradition, not that it is intrinsically sound. As to weak tradition, inasmuch as the reporter of such is chargeable with either falseness or impiety, it cannot be strengthened by multiplicity of ways of descent, which is true, for example, of the tradition: ‘The investigation of science is a revealed requirement?’ this tradition, in the words of ‘al-Baihākī, is one widely known among men, with a weak support—it is reported, indeed, by many ways of descent, every one of which is weak.

“SECTION THIRD.

“Weak Tradition.

“This is that which does not embrace the conditions of the sound and the fair. It varies in degrees of weakness in proportion as it is remote from the conditions of soundness and fairness. In the opinion of the doctors, a laxity respecting the supports of weak tradition, with the exception of the suppositions, is admissible, to the neglect of any declaration of its weakness, in the case of admonitions, narratives, and the active virtues, but not when the tradition has reference to the attributes of the Supreme God, or to judicial decisions with regard to the lawful and the forbidden. The practice of ‘an-Nasā’i is said to have been to give out tradition on the authority of any one whom men had not agreed to abandon as a guide; ‘Abū-Dāwud was accustomed to take whatever offered, to give out weak tradition when he found no other under a particular head, and to ascribe to that a weight superior to the mere judgment of the guarantees; ‘ash-Sha’bī,* also, is said to have remarked: ‘Whatever these persons tell thee for a tradition, take it up; but cast away from thee what they say on their own judgment,’ and another saying of his is the following: ‘Opinion is carrion—when need requires, eat it;’ of ‘ash-Shāfi’ī—to whom may God be merciful!—we are told that he said: ‘Whatever I declare as a saying of the Prophet . . . , or lay down as a principle, by the expression: “on the authority of the Messenger of God . . . ,” at variance with something otherwise said by me, the true saying is that of the Prophet . . . , which I hereby make my declaration, to the refutation of anything so said by me [to the contrary]’—of which there are numerous interpretations, some applying it to all three divisions of tradition, to wit, the sound, the fair, and the weak, and some restricting it to the weak.

“Now to the first kind of tradition pertain the following:

[1.] “The sustained (صَمْدٌ), namely, that of which the support is continuous, being at the same time carried back to the Messenger of God. . . .

* ‘Ash-Sha’bī died A. H. 96. He reported traditions on the wars of the Prophet. “No man tells me a tradition without my remembering it,” was another of his sayings. See *Kitāb Tab.*, iii. 11.

[2.] “The continuous (المُتَسْلِل), namely, that of which the support is continuous, whether it be carried back to the Prophet ... or stopped.

[3.] “The carried back (المُرْفَع), or that which is attributed to the Prophet ..., as his in particular, of saying, or action, or confirmation, whether it be continuous or dissevered: so that continuous tradition may be either carried back or not carried back, and tradition which is carried back may be either continuous or not continuous; whereas sustained tradition is both continuous and carried back.

[4.] “Tradition on authority (المُعْنَى), namely, that which is supported by the expression: ‘Such a one says on the authority of such a one,’ which may be correctly viewed as continuous, in case the two persons can have met, and provided there be no disguising, of which examples are to be found in the *Sahih* of *al-Bukhārī* as well as in that of *Muslim*. ‘Ibn ‘as-Salāh says: ‘In our time, and within a short period, there has been much use made of the expression “on the authority of,” in the act of license; but, when one says: “Such a one says on the authority of a certain guaranteee, on the authority of such a one,” it is most likely that the tradition is dissevered, and that without being so much as a loosened tradition.’

[5.] “The summarily given (المُعْلَق), namely, that from which one reporter, or more, of the support, has been cut off at the beginning—the term being derived from the closing up of a wall, or the despatch of a writing of divorce, a cutting short of connection being implied in those two actions. There may be a cutting off either [a] at the beginning of the support, in which case the tradition is summarily given, or [b] in the middle, which makes it dissevered, or [c] at the end, whereby it becomes loosened. ‘Al-Bukhārī admits many traditions of this species into his *Sahih*, nor is any summary tradition, contained in that book, out of place, because either the reliable authorities depended upon in the summary statement of it have caused it to be recognized, or else it is mentioned by the author, in some other part of his book, as a continuous tradition.

[6.] “Unique traditions(الْفُرَاد). A tradition may be unique either as regards all reporters, or in a certain respect, as, for example, that the people of Makkah alone report it; unique tradition, therefore, is not weak, unless the term be used to signify that one single reporter gives it out.

[7.] “The involved (المُدَرِّج), consisting of the words of some reporter interwoven with a tradition, so that they are believed to form a part of it. It may also happen that two texts, having two supports, are woven together, as in the case of the report of Sa’id Bin ‘Abū-Miryam: ‘Hate ye not one another, neither be envious one of another, nor turn the back upon one another, nor be rivals one of another,’ where the words: ‘nor be rivals one of another’ are interwoven by ‘Ibn ‘Abū-Miryam from another text; or else a reporter may lay hold of some text, at the end of a tradition, together with some master’s support which belongs to another text, and then report both texts on the authority of that master, with one support, the two supports being reduced to one; or else he may hear a single tradition from a number of persons, who differ in respect

either to its support or its text, and thereupon, by interweaving, make it appear that they all report harmoniously, not mentioning the disagreement—all which it is forbidden to do intentionally.

[8.] “The notorious (المشهور), namely, that which is particularly wide spread among traditionists, because of its being transmitted by many reporters, such as, for example, the tradition that ‘the Messenger of God . . . worshipped God for a month, in prayer at the head of a company;’ or which is well known both among traditionists and others, as, for example, the tradition: ‘Actions are not without intentions;’ or which is known particularly among others than traditionists: says the eminent teacher ‘Ahmad: ‘That the Prophet said to an inquirer: “It is a duty, though one come mounted upon a horse,”* and: “The day of your slaying for sacrifice is the day on which you are to fast,” are traditions current in the market-place, though, when criticised, they are found to be without foundation.’

[9.] “The unrelated and the rare (الغريب والعريب). Unrelated tradition is said to be the tradition, for example, of ‘az Zuhri, or of some such individual, being one whose uprightness and retentiveness suffice to secure a place for his tradition in collections. If a certain guarantee stands alone in giving a tradition, it is called unrelated; but if two or three, apart from others, report it, it is called rare; if reported by a number of persons, it is called notorious. Traditions unique as belonging to certain provinces are not unrelated. Unrelated tradition is either sound, like the unique traditions given out in ‘al-Bukhāri’s *Ṣaḥīḥ*, or not sound, the latter being most commonly the case. Again, unrelated tradition is such in respect either to the support or the text, namely, that of which only one person reports the text, or in respect to support and not text, as, for example, any tradition of which the text is recognized on the authority of several of the Companions of the Prophet, in case it is reported, on the authority of some other witness of the Prophet, by one person alone, to which ‘at-Tarmidhī refers in his expression: ‘unrelated by this way of descent.’ There is no such thing as a tradition unrelated in respect to text, without being so in respect to support, except when an [absolutely] unique tradition becomes notorious, so that many persons report it on the authority of him who alone vouches for it—whereby it is made a notorious unrelated tradition: as for the tradition: ‘Actions are only according to intentions,’ the first part of its support has the quality of being unrelated, while the last part of it is notorious.

[10.] “The wrongly told (المصوَّف), which may be such [a] in respect to the identity of a reporter, as, for example, a tradition of Shubāh on the authority of ‘al-Auwām Bin Murājim—with *rā’* and *jim*—which Yahya Bin Ma’īn tells wrongly, saying: ‘Muzāhim’—with *zāy* and *hā’*; or [b] in respect to the identity of a tradition, as, for example, in the case of the saying of the Prophet . . . ‘Whoever fasts in Ramādhan, and continues fasting for six days of the month Shauwāl,’ which some persons tell wrongly, using the expression ‘for some days’—*shai’ān* for *sittān*.

* i. e., for all, high and low.

[11.] "The chain-wise (السلسلة), namely, that of which the guaranteees who make up its support, even back to the Prophet . . . , follow one another, in reporting it, on one and the same footing, whether this be a matter which [a] concerns the reporter himself, for example, the tradition being a saying: 'I heard such a one say: "I heard such a one say,'" and so on to the end, or: 'Such a one informs us, in the name of God, saying: "Such a one informs us, in the name of God,'" and so on to the end; or, the tradition being an action, like that in respect to folding the fingers together;* or, it being both a saying and an action, like the tradition: 'O God, it concerns me that I owe thee remembrance, and gratitude, and fair service,' which, as reported by 'Abū-Dāwud, 'Ahmad and 'an-Nasā'i, runs thus, in the words of the reporter: 'The Messenger of God . . . took me by the hand, and said: "Truly I love thee; so then do thou say: 'O God, it concerns me, etc.'"'; or, the tradition being dependent upon a qualification, like the jurists' tradition, told by jurist from jurist: 'Two persons who have bargained together with reference to a sale, are at liberty in regard to it so long as they have not parted from each other;† or whether it be a matter which [b] concerns the report, as in the case of a tradition which is chain-wise by virtue of coincidence in name, or surname, or genealogy, or national appellative, between reporters and their predecessors: says the eminent teacher 'an-Nawawī: 'I also report three traditions which are chain-wise through natives of Damascus.'

"Investigation of the state of a tradition, in order to ascertain whether its reporter stands alone with it or not, and whether it is recognized or not, is called criticism (الاعتبار).

"To the second kind of tradition, distinguished as the weak, pertain the following:

[1.] "The stopped (الموقوف), namely, in general, whatever is reported from a witness of the Prophet, being a tradition either of saying or action, whether continuous or dissevered. It is not legal proof, according to the soundest view. The term is also used in a restricted sense, with reference to others than a witness of the Prophet, as, for example, in the remark: 'It is stopped by Mu'ammār at Hammām,' and in the following: 'It is stopped by Mālik at Nāfi.' A declaration by a witness of the Prophet in the words: 'We were accustomed to do so and so in the time of the Prophet . . .' constitutes a tradition carried back, because the action, obviously, must have been noticed by the Prophet, and have received his confirmation; equally carried back, to all intents, is the tradition: 'His Companions were wont to knock upon his door with their nails.' Kurānic exposition by a witness of the Prophet is stopped tradition; but any tradition of a witness which is of the nature of a reason for a particular revelation, as, for example, the saying of Jābir:

* One of the chapters of the Book of Prayer in 'al-Bukhārī's *Sahīh* is entitled باب تشبيك الأصياغ في المساجد وغبيروه, i. e. *Chapter on Folding the Fingers together in the Mosque and elsewhere*. See MS., fol. 22, rect.

† This tradition makes the forty-third chapter of the Book of Sales in 'al-Bukhārī's *Sahīh*. See MS., fol. 86, rect.

'The Jews were wont to say so and so, whereupon the Glorious and Supreme God made a revelation so and so,' or the like, is carried back.

[2.] "The mutilated (المقطوع), which is whatever has come down from followers of the Prophet in the second degree, of their sayings and doings, being stopped at them. It is not legal proof.

[3.] "The loosened (المُرْسَل), which consists in the saying by a follower of the Prophet in the second degree: 'The Messenger of God said so and so' (or, 'did so and so'). This, according to both practice and theory in jurisprudence, is recognized tradition, while at the same time there is some difference of opinion with regard to it, and 'ash-Shâfi'i makes it the subject of a distinction which is stated in the *'Uṣūl 'al-Fiqh*.

[4.] "The dissevered (المقطع), namely, that of which the support is, anyhow, not continuous, be it that a reporter is passed over either at the beginning of the support, or in the middle, or at the end of it; only that the term is commonly employed with reference to reporting on the authority of a witness of the Prophet, by one of a later age than a follower in the second degree, as, for example: 'Says Mâlik, on the authority of 'Umar.'

[5.] "The straitened (المُعَصَل)—the participle being pronounced with *fath* on the *dhâd*—namely, that from the support of which two or more reporters have dropped out, as, for example, Mâlik's saying: 'Says the Messenger of God ...,' and 'ash-Shâfi'i's saying: 'Says 'Ibn 'Umar so and so.'

[6.] "The separate and the undetermined (الشاذ والمُنْكَر). Says 'ash-Shâfi'i—to whom may God be merciful!—'Separate tradition is that which a reliable authority reports at variance with common report.' In the words of 'Ibn 'as-Salâh: 'There are several sorts of separate tradition: that from which varies some reporter who has better memory and more retentiveness than its single reporter, is rejected separate tradition; if no one of better memory differs from the single reporter, and the latter is upright and retentive, the tradition is sound; if he who reports the separate tradition is not retentive, yet not far from the rank of a retentive reporter, it is fair; if its reporter is far from being retentive, it is undetermined.' The discrimination of the words: 'some reporter who has better memory and more retentiveness' denotes that a tradition differed from is not rejected when equal as respects the grade of its reporter to that which differs from it. What undetermined tradition is, may be seen from the classification just quoted.

[7.] "The specious (المُبَلِّل), namely, that involving certain hidden, subtle assumptions, to its injury, which are evidently unauthorized. Such assumptions are discovered by the circumstance that a tradition has only one reporter, or is differed from, in connection with certain other things by which an intelligent person is put upon his guard against either a loosening in tradition which is [apparently] unbroken, or a stoppage in that which is [seemingly] carried back to the Prophet, or a confounding of one tradition with another, or an error on the part of some person deficient in accuracy—so that he is constrained not to think the tradition to be what it seems, and judges accordingly, or is embarrassed and

made undecided, inasmuch as all the circumstances referred to hinder the pronouncing of a tradition to be sound. The tradition of Ya'la Bin 'Ubaid, on the authority of 'ath-Thauri, on the authority of 'Amrū Bin Dīnār, on the authority of 'Ibn 'Umar, on the authority of the Prophet... 'The seller and buyer are at liberty,' is supported continuously by the authority of an upright and retentive reporter, and the text is sound, while at the same time it is a specious tradition: for 'Amrū Bin Dīnār has been put in the place of his brother 'Abdallah Bin Dīnār—it is thus that the eminent teachers among the followers of 'ath-Thauri report it from him—so that Ya'la has fallen into an error. The term 'prentence' (العلة) is, indeed, applied, in the general sense [of something unreliable], to falseness, carelessness, defect of memory, and the like; and some persons even use it to signify what it has no applicability to, and is not injurious to the soundness of a tradition, as, for example, the loosening of some tradition which virtually reaches to the Prophet by the report of a retentive, reliable authority, so that they go so far as to say: 'one department of sound tradition is the specious sound,' just as another says: 'one department of sound tradition is the separate sound,' including under this latter appellation the tradition of Ya'la Bin 'Ubaid: 'The seller and buyer are at liberty.'

[8.] "The disguised (المدلس), of which the defect lies hidden, either [a] in the making up of its support, namely, that one reports on the authority of a person whom he had met, or whose contemporary he was, without having received instruction in tradition from him, in such a way as to lead to the supposition that he was instructed by him (for he ought not to say: 'Such a one tells us for a tradition,' but, instead of this: 'Such a one says,' or 'Such a one is responsible for the following,' or the like); and often it is not his master whom the disguiser drops out, but some weak guarantee, or one of immature age [farther on in the chain of connection], thereby giving a fair appearance to the tradition, as did, for example, 'al-'A'mash, 'ath-Thauri, and others—both which ways of reporting offend very much the sense of propriety, and are condemned by most of the doctors: there is, however, a difference of opinion with regard to the reception of a disguised report of tradition; and it is most correct to draw a distinction, that which is reported in language capable of being understood not to express an actual hearing of it being judged of in the same manner as tradition which is loosened, or of that sort,* while that which is reported in language clearly expressive of continuousness, as, for example: 'I have heard,' or 'Such a one informs us,' or 'Such a one tells us for a tradition,' or the like, is used as legal proof; or [b] in the designation of actual masters, namely, that one reports, on the authority of some master, a tradition which he did indeed hear from him, but gives him a name, or a surname, or a genealogy, or an appellative, by which he is not known, in order that he may not be recognized: to do this is a very light matter, and yet such a proceeding renders worthless whatever is reported on the authority of the person so disguised, causing difficulty, as it does, in the way of knowing his circumstances, and is more or less displeasing according to the mo-

* viz., by the character of the reporter.

tive which impels to it, be this either that reports on the authority of the disguised person abound (for it is not agreeable to multiply traditions from a single individual, in one and the same form), or that one is impelled to the disguise by the fact that his master, whose designation he alters, was not a reliable authority, or was younger than himself, or by some such consideration.

[9.] "The unstable (المُنْصَطِبُ), namely, that of which the report varies, without any preponderance in authority of one report over another, such as that the reporter of one had better memory, or more followers in respect to reporting tradition on his authority, than another, leading to a decision in favor of that which has the greater weight: in case a decision between differing reports is practicable, the tradition is not unstable; but instability arises where there is no preponderance.

[10.] "The reversed (المُنْقَلَبُ), namely, for example, a tradition, notorious on the authority of Sâlim, which is put down as authorized by Nâfi', in order that it may, for one's pleasure, become an unrelated tradition. The tradition about 'al-Bukhârî, when he came to Baghdâd, and the masters put him to trial by reversing supports, is well-known.*

[11.] "The supposititious (المُوْصَوْعُ), namely, hearsay (الْمُرْدِفُ), whether it must be regarded as true, having been shown by eminent teachers to be correct, or whether it must be pronounced false, such teachers having shown it to be fictitious, or whether it be doubtful, on account of the possibility of either truth or falsehood in the case, like other rumors. Supposititious tradition must not be reported by one who is aware of its character, let it signify what it may, unless accompanied with a declaration of its supposititiousness. It may be known either by confession on the part of him who made it up, or by the want of sense in its phraseology, or by the discovery of some such error in it as that which Thâbit 'Ibn Mûsa 'az-Zâhid fell into respecting the tradition: 'Whoever prays much at night has a fair countenance by day:' a certain master, it is said, was giving out tradition in the midst of an assembly of people, when a man of fair countenance entered; whereupon the master said, on repeating his tradition: 'Whoever prays much, etc.,' which led Thâbit to think that these words were a part of the tradition, and he reported accordingly. Supposititious tradition may originate with several sorts of persons, most of whom make it up at some risk, like 'az-Zâhid, and therefore blameably. Entire traditions of a supposititious character were made up by the Zanâdiqâh,† whose bad wares, and the disgrace of whose conduct, have been in later times successfully exposed by men skilled in the science, and brought to nought—to God be the praise! The Karrâmiyah,‡ and the 'Innovating Sect,' considered it lawful to make up tradition with regard to religious contemplation and the monastic life. This species of tradition is referred to in a report on the authority of 'Abû-'Usmâh Nûh 'Ibn Miryam, namely, that he was asked: 'How is it that thou hast traditions on the authority of 'Ikrimah, on the authority of 'Ibn 'Abbâs, respecting the virtues of the Kurâن, chapter by

* See *Zeitschrift d. D. M. Gesellschaft*, iv. 6.

† A sect of dualists.

‡ A sect of anthropomorphists.

chapter?" to which he replied: 'I saw that men were diverted from the Kurâن, and busied themselves with the *Fîkh* of 'Abû-Hanîfah, and the *Mağhâzi* of Muhammâd Bin 'Ishâk, and so I made up these traditions as a substitute: now commentators on the Kurâن, not prevented by the grace of God, have committed the error of bringing forward such traditions in their commentaries; and among others which they cite is the following, that the Prophet . . . when he had read the words: "and Manâh the third, the other,"* added: "As for those tender girls, there is no hope of their intercession," which we have enlarged upon, by way of refuting it, under the chapter headed "It is worship of God to read the Kurâن." accordingly, whatever they who treat of the principles of Islâm allege as having been said by the Prophet, in case I am referred to as authority for any tradition, confront it with the Book of God, and, if it agrees therewith, accept it; otherwise, reject it.' 'Al-Khatîb says: 'The Zanâdîkah made up tradition, notwithstanding the disownance of that saying of the Prophet . . . "The Book, and that which is equivalent thereto" (or, as it is also reported, "and the like of it together with it"), was brought to me by divine inspiration.' 'Ibn 'aj-Jauzî composed volumes relative to supposititious traditions, wherein, as 'Ibn 'as-Ṣalâh says, he brings forward many simply weak traditions, not proved to have been made up, for which the proper place would be among weak traditions. There is also a work by the master 'al-Hasan Bin Muhammâd 'as-Saghîhâni, entitled *The Choice Pearl on the Detection of Error* (الدر الملتقط في تبيين الغلط).†

On comparing these definitions given of the several kinds and species of tradition by 'Abd 'al-Hâkîk and 'aj-Jurjâni, we find no radical disagreement between the two writers, notwithstanding the four centuries and a half which separated them from each other, but only some differences of form which seem not to require any comment. We may, therefore, proceed at once to another extract, which will be from Muslim's introduction to his *Sahîh*. We have not met with any classification of traditions by this author; but in the following passage he throws some additional light upon the received system of tradition, by a discussion of what constitutes soundness of report, arguing against a certain condition which some held to be essential to it. It may be well to remind the reader that Muslim lived about five centuries and a half before the earliest of the authorities last quoted from.§

* See Kur., liii. 20.

† See *Hâji Khalf. Lex.*, iii. 191.

‡ Died A. H. 597.

§ This passage is quoted from pp. 20-27.

باب ما تصحّح به روایة الرواية بعضهم عن بعض
والتنبيه على من غلط في ذلك

وقد تكلم بعض من تحلى الحديث من اهل عصرنا في تصحيح الاسانيد وسقينها بقول لو اضربنا عن حكایته وذكر فساده صفاحا لكان رأينا منتبينا ومذهبها صحیحا اذ الاعراض عن القول المطروح اخرى لامانته واحمال ذكر قائله واجدر ان لا يكون ذلك تنبيها للجهال عليه غير انا ما تخفونا من شرور العواقب واغترار الجهلة بمحذثات الامور واسراعهم الى اعتقاد خطاء المخطئين والقول الساقطة عند العلماء رأينا التشف عن فساد قوله ورد مقالته بقدر ما يليق بها من الرد اجري عن الانام واحمد للعاقبة ان شاء الله عز وجل و Zum القائل الذي افتتحنا اتكلام على الحكایة عن قوله والاخبار عن سوء روبته ان كل اسناد الحديث فيه فلان عن فلان وقد احاط العلم بانهما قد كانوا في عصر واحد وجایز ان يكون الحديث الذي روی الرادی عن روی عنه قد سمعه منه وشافه به غير انه لا يعلم له منه سماعا ولم نجد في شيء من الروايات انهما التقى فقط او تشاورا بحديث ان الحجة لا تقوم عنده بكل خبر جاء هذا الجبی حتى يكون عنده العلم بانهما قد اجتمعوا من دھرها مرتة فصاعد او تشاورها بالحديث بينهما او يرد خبر فيه بيان اجتماعهما او تلاقيهم مرتة من دھرها فان لم يكن عنده علم ذلك ولم يأت روایة تخبر ان هذا الرواوى عن صاحبها قد لقيه مرتة وسمع منه شيئا لم يكن في نقله الخبر عن روی عنه علم ذلك والامر كما وصفنا حجة وكان الخبر عنده موقعا حتى يرد عليه سماعا منه لشيء من الحديث قل او كثر في روایة مثل ما ورد وهذا القول يرحمك الله في الطعن في الاسانيد قول مخترع مستحدث غير مسبوق صاحبها البه ولا مساعد له من اهل العلم عليه وذلك ان القول الشائع المتفق عليه بين اهل العلم بالاخبار والروايات قد يأ وحديئنا ان كل رجل ثقة روی عن مثله حديثا وجایز مكن له لقاوه والسماع منه نكونهما جمیعا كانا في عصر واحد وان لم يأت في خبر فقط انهما اجتمعوا ولا تشاورا بكلام فالرواية ثابتة وأحجة بها لازمة الا ان يكون هناك دلالة بيّنة ان هذا الرواوى لم يلتف من روی عنه او لم يسمع منه شيئا

فاما والامر بهم على الامكان الذى فسرنا فالرواية على السماع ابدا حتى تكون الدلالة التى بيّنا فيقال لمخترع هذا القول الذى وصفنا مقالته او للذاب عنه قد اعطيت في جملة قولك ان خبر الواحد الثقة عن الواحد الثقة حجة يلزم به العمل ثم ادخلت فيه الشرط بعد فقلت حتى يعلم انهما قد كانا التقى مرتّة فصاعدا او سمع منه شيئاً فهل تجده هذا الشرط الذى اشتربته عن احد يلزم قوله ولا فهلم دليلا على ما زعمت فان ادّى قول احد من علماء السلف بما رعم من ادخال الشرط في تثبيت الخبر طولب به ولن يجد هو ولا غيره الى اجاده سبيلا وان هو ادّى فيما زعم دليلا يحتاج به قبيل له وما ذاك الدليل فان قال قلتة لانى وجدت رواة الاخبار قد يما وحديتنا بروى احمد عن الاخر الحديث ولما يعاينه ولا سمع منه شيئاً فقط فلما رأيتمهم استجروا رواية الحديث بينهم هكذا على الارسال من غير سماع والمرسل من الروايات في اصل قولنا وقول اهل العلم بالاخبار ليس بحاجة احتاجت لما وصفت من العلة الى البحث عن سماع الراوى كل خبر عن راويه فاذا انا هاجمت على سماعه منه لادنى شيئاً ثبت عندي بذلك جميع ما يروى عنه بعد فان عزب على معرفة ذلك او فقت الخبر ولم يكن عندي موضع حجة لامكان الارسال فيه فيقال له فان كانت العلة في تضييفك للخبر وتركك الاحتجاج به امكان الارسال فيه لزموك ان لا تثبت اسناداً معنعاً حتى ترى فيه السماع من اوله الى اخره وذلك ان الحديث الوارد علينا باسناد هشام بن عروة عن ابيه عن عائشة رضى الله عنها فبيقين نعلم ان هشاما قد سمع من ابيه وأن اباها قد سمع من عائشة رضى الله عنها كما نعلم ان عائشة قد سمعت من النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وقد يجوز اذا لم يقل هشام في رواية يرويها عن ابيه سمعت او اخبرنى ان يكون بينه وبين ابيه في تلك الرواية انسان اخر اخبره بها عن ابيه ولم يسمعها هو من ابيه لما احب ان يرويها مرسلا ولا يسندها الى من سمعها منه وكما يكن ذلك في هشام عن ابيه فهو ايضاً م肯 في ابيه عن عائشة رضى الله عنها وكذلك كل اسناد الحديث ليس فيه ذكر سماع بعضهم من بعض وان كان قد عرف في الجلة ان كل واحد منهم قد سمع من صاحبه ساماً كثيراً فجائز لكل واحد

منهم أن ينزل في بعض الرواية فيسمى من غيره عنه بعض أحاديثه ثم يرسله عنه أحياناً ولا يسمى من سمع منه وينشط أحياناً فيسمى الرجل الذي حمل عنه الحديث وينزل الأرسال وما قلنا من هذا موجود في الحديث مستفيض من فعل ثقان للحدثين وأيّة أهل العلم وسنذكر من روایتهم على الجهة التي ذكرنا عدداً يستدلّ بها على أكثر منها أن شاء الله تعالى فمن ذلك أن أيوب السختياني وأبي المبارك وكبيعاً وأبي ثور وجماعة غيرهم روا عن هشام ابن عروة عن أبيه عن عائشة رضي الله عنها كنت أطّيب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لحّنه وحرمه باطّيب ما أجد فروي هذه الرواية بعينها الليث ابن سعد وذاؤود العطار وحميد بن الأسود وعقبب بن خالد وأبو أسامة عن هشام قال أخبرني عثمان بن عروة عن عروة عن عائشة رضي الله عنها عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وروى هشام عن أبيه عن عائشة رضي الله عنها كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم إذا اعتكف يدلي إلى رأسه فارجله وإنما حايسن فرواها بعينها مالك بن أنس عن الزهري عن عروة عن عمرة عن عائشة رضي الله عنها عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وروى الزهري وصالح ابن أبي حسان عن أبي سلمة عن عائشة رضي الله عنها كان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقبل وهو صائم فقال جحى بن أبي كثير في هذا الخبر في القبلة أخبرني أبو سلمة بن عبد الرحمن أن عمر ابن عبد العزيز أخبره أن عروة أخبره أن عائشة رضي الله عنها أخبرته أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يقبلها وهو صائم وروى ابن عبيدة وغيره عن عمرو بن دينار عن جابر رضي الله عنه قال أطعمنا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لحوم الخيل ونها عن لحوم الحمر الأهلية فرواه حماد بن زيد عن عمرو وعن محمد بن علي عن جابر رضي الله عنه عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وهذا النحو في الروايات كثير يكثّر تعداده وفيما ذكرنا منها كفاية لذوى الفهم فإذا كانت العلة عند من وصفنا قوله قبل في فساد الحديث وتهوينه إذا لم يعلم أن الرواى قد سمع من روى عنه شيئاً ملماً الأرسال فيه لزمه ترك الاحتجاج في قياد قوله برواية من يعلم أنه قد سمع من قد روى عنه إلا في نفس الخبر الذي فيه ذكر السماع لما بيننا من قبل عن الآية الذين نقلوا الأخبار أنه

كانت لهم تارات يرسلون فيها الحديث ارسالا ولا يذكرون من سمعوه منه وتارات ينشطون فيها فيسندون الخبر على هيئة ما سمعوا فيخبرون بالنحو ان نذلوا وبالصعود ان صعدوا كما شرحنا ذلك عنهم وما علمنا احدا من اية السلف من يستعمل الاخبار وينتقد صحة الاسانيد وسقمهما مثل ايوب السختياني وابن عون ومالك بن انس وشعبة بن الحجاج وبحري بن سعيد القطان وعبد الرحمن ابن مهدي ومن بعدهم من اهل الحديث فتشوا عن موضع السماع في الاسانيد كما ادعاه الذي وصفنا قوله من قبل وانما كان تفقد من تفقد منهم سماع رواة الحديث من روى عنهم اذا كان الراوى من عرف بالتدليس في الحديث وشهر به فحينئذ يبحثون عن سماعه في روايته وينتقدون ذلك منه كي تنزاح عنهم علة التدليس فاما ابتغاء ذلك من غير مدلس على الوجه الذي زعم من حكينا قوله فما سمعنا ذلك من سمعينا وله تسمم من الاية من ذلك ان عبد الله بن يزيد الانصاري وقد رأى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قد روى عن حذيفة وعن ابي مسعود الانصاري وعن كل واحد منهمما حديثا يسنده الى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وليس في روايته عنهما ذكر السماع منهما ولا حفظنا في شيء من الروايات ان عبد الله ابن يزيد شافه حذيفة وابا مسعود رضي الله عنهمما بحديث افظ ولا وجدنا ذكر روايته ايها في رواية بعينها ولم يسمع عن احد من اهل العلم من مصري ولا من ادركنا انه طعن في هذين الخبرين اللذين رواهما عبد الله ابن يزيد عن حذيفة وابي مسعود بضعف فيهما بل بما اشبههما عند من لاقينا من اهل العلم بالحديث من صالح الاسانيد وقويهما يرون استعمال ما تقل بها والاحتجاج بما انت من سفن واتار وهي في زعم من حكينا قوله من قبل واهية مهملة حتى نصيّب سماع الراوى عمن روى ولو ذهبتنا نعده الاخبار الص صالح عند اهل العلم من يهين بزعم هذا القائل وخصبها لجهونا عن تقضي ذكرها واحصايتها كلها ولكننا احربينا ان ننصب منها عددا يكفي سمة من سكتنا عنه منها وهذا ابو عثمان النهدي وابو رافع الصائغ وما من ادرك الجاهلية واحبها اصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من البداريين هام جرا ونقلنا عنهم الاخبار حتى نزل الى مثل

أبى هريرة وابن عمر وذويهما قد أسنن كل واحد منها عن أبى بن كعب رضى الله عنه عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً ولم يسمع فى رواية بعينها أنهم عاينوا أبىأيا أو سمعاً منه شيئاً وأسنن أبو عمرو الشيبانى وهو من ادرك الجاهلية وكان فى زمان النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم رجلاً وأبوا معمر عبد الله بن سنتخبرة كل واحد منها عن أبى مسعود الانصاري عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم خبرين وأسنن عبيد بن عمير عن أم سلمة زوج النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وعبيد ولد فى زمان النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وأسنن قيس بن أبى حازم وقد ادرك زمن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم عن أبى مسعود الانصاري عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاثة أخبار وأسنن عبد الرحمن بن أبى ليلى وقد حفظ عن عمر بن الخطاب وحباب علياً رضى الله عنهما عن أنس بن مالك عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسنن ربعى بن حراش عن عمران بن حصين عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثين وعن أبى بكره عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وقد سمع رباعى من على بن أبى طالب رضى الله عنه وروى عنه وأسنن نافع ابن حببر بن مطعم عن أبى شريح الخزاعى عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسنن النعمان بن أبى عياش عن أبى سعيد الخدري رضى الله عنه ثلاثة احاديث عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وأسنن عطاء ابن يزيد الدارى عن تميم الدارى عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسنن سليمان بن يسار عن رافع ابن خديج عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم حديثاً وأسنن حميد بن عبد الرحمن الجميри عن أبى هريرة عن النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم احاديث فكل هؤلاء التابعين الذين نصبنا روايتهم عن الصحابة الذين سمعناهم لم يحفظ عنهم سماع علمناه منهم فى رواية بعينها ولا انهم لقوه فى نفس خبر بعينه وهي اسانيد عند ذوى المعرفة بالاخبار والروايات من مخاچ الاسانيد لا نعلمهم وقفنوا منها شيئاً قط ولا التمسوا فيها سماع بعضهم من بعض اذا السماع لكل واحد منهم مكن من صاحبه غير مستنكر لكونهم جميعاً كانوا في العصر الذي اتفقوا فيه وكان هذا القول الذي احدثه القائل الذي حكيناه في توهين

ال الحديث بالعلة التي وصف اقل من ان يعرج عليه ويتار ذكره اذ كان قوله
محمدنا وكلاما خلفا لم يقله احد من اهل العلم سلف ويسئلناه من بعدم
خلف فلا حاجة بنا في ردّه باكثر ما شرحنا اذ كان قدر المقالة وقائماها القدر
الذى وصفناه والله المستعان على دفع ما خالف مذهب العلماء وعليه
التكلان

*“Chapter on what constitutes Soundness in the Report of one Reporter
on the Authority of Another, with Warning against such as have erred
on the subject.*

“One of our contemporaries, professing a knowledge of tradition, has argued respecting what constitutes sound and unsound reports, in language which it would be well judged, and perfectly reasonable, to avoid speaking of, and the viciousness of which might well be left unnoticed, since to disregard the language thus obtruded upon us would be another mode of getting rid of it, and of obscuring the remembrance of its author, beside that it were more suitable not to warn the ignorant against what they know nothing of, by calling attention to it. Yet, because we fear bad consequences, in the end, and that the ignorant may be deceived by certain novel injunctions, and may be induced to put confidence in the false views of errorists, and in sayings not maintained among the doctors, we have thought fit to expose the viciousness of our contemporary's language, and to refute his notion by a sufficiency of argument against it. This I propose to do, with no reliance upon man. Praise be to God for my success, if He, the Great and Glorious, wills it.

“The person whose language we design to speak of, and whose inconsiderateness we intend to set forth in the remarks which we have begun, imagines that, in the case of every support of a tradition in which occurs the expression ‘... such a one, on the authority of such a one,’ the two are known to have been of one and the same generation; whereas it is admissible that a tradition reported on the authority of any one was heard by the reporter from him, and was uttered to the reporter by him, though it be not known for certain that the one received tradition orally from the other, and though we find it not stated, in any report whatever, that the two ever met, or spoke tradition one to the other. In his opinion, no traditional statement (خبر) which has come down in the form referred to avails for the establishment of law, until one absolutely knows that the two reporters were together once or oftener in their life time, or communicated tradition orally one to the other, or until one gets hold of some traditional statement which distinctly recognizes that the two were together, or met, once, at least, in their life-time; so that, if one possesses no positive knowledge of the fact, and no report reaches him which implies that he who thus reports ‘on the authority of’ his alleged master did actually once meet him, and hear some tradition from him, the statement, as transmitted by such reporter, wants that authority in its favor which is constituted by a person, reported from, of whom such knowledge exists: whereas a tradition of the sort here described is

legal proof. Moreover, in his opinion, a traditional statement in the form referred to is stopped (موقوف), until, by some report which is like to that in question, one learns of the reporter's having heard more or less of tradition from him on whose authority he reports.

"Now, this language—may God mercifully preserve thee from defaming the supports of tradition!—is strange, innovating, without ground in the views of any earlier author, and not favored by any other traditionist: that is to say, the language universally accepted and current among those conversant with traditional statements and reports, both in ancient and modern times, is this, that every supporter of tradition, being a reliable authority, reports on the authority of his like, and that his having met the latter, and having received oral instruction in tradition from him, consequently upon the contemporaneousness of the two, is a thing to be admitted, which may or may not have been a fact, although one never gets hold of a traditional statement that the two were at any time together, or ever made any oral communication one to the other. A report is, therefore, established, and the legal proof which it involves is binding, unless it be clearly shown that the reporter, in a particular case of report 'on the authority of' another, did not meet him whose authority he alleges, or did not receive any oral instruction in tradition from him; so that, however uncertain the fact may be, on account of that possibility either way which we have set forth, yet the report forever rests on the basis of oral communication, until one has the demonstration to the contrary just spoken of.

"We say, then, in reply to him who has set on foot this talk of which we have presented the substance, or rather to put a stop to it: in all that thou sayest, thou grantest that the traditional statement of one reporter who is reliable, 'on the authority of' a reliable reporter, constitutes legal proof, and obligates conduct; and then thou bringest in a condition, and sayest 'so long as it is known that the two had met once or oftener, or that the one had received some oral instruction in tradition from the other,' but how dost thou ascertain this that thou conditionest to be a fact, on the authority of one whose word is binding? and if such ascertainment is wanting, what becomes of all evidence in favor of the notion thou hast taken up? Should he pretend that even a single one of the primitive doctors expressed himself in favor of his notion as to making a certain condition essential to the confirmation of that form of traditional statement which is in question, most certainly neither he nor any one else will be able to produce such an expression. But if he pretends that there is any argumentative proof of the correctness of his opinion, we reply to him by inquiring what that proof is. Should he say: 'I adopt this language because I have found reporters of traditional statements, both ancient and modern, reporting tradition one from another, in spite of the fact that the reporter had not seen him on whose authority he reports, and had not heard any tradition from him. For, after I saw that reporters allowed themselves to report tradition in such a loose manner (على الاسماں), without any oral communication—loose report, according to fundamental principles which we maintain in common with all who are conversant with traditional statements, not being legal proof—I felt it to be necessary, for the reason indicated, to investigate re-

specting the fact of a reporter's having heard whatever traditional statement he gives 'on the authority of' another. So, now, having ascertained that the former did receive the least oral instruction in tradition from the latter, I become satisfied of the validity of all that he reports on the latter's authority; but, if the knowledge of that fact fails me, I regard his statement as stopped (أوقفت أخف), and the possibility of its being a loose report is, in my opinion, a reason for rejecting it as a vehicle of legal proof"—should he say this, we reply as follows :

"If thou regardest a traditional statement as weak, and dost renounce making out legal proof by means of it, on account of the possibility of looseness in it, thou art necessitated not to consider a support 'on authority' (اسناد معنون) as stable until thou seest that oral communication extends from the beginning to the end of it. That is to say, in the case of a tradition which comes to us with the support of '... Hishâm Bin 'Urwah, on the authority of his father, on the authority of 'Â'ishah'—to whom may God be gracious!—we are assured that Hishâm heard tradition from his father, and that his father heard from 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—as we are assured that 'Â'ishah heard tradition from the Prophet ...; and yet, since Hishâm does not say, in any report which he gives on his father's authority : 'I heard ...', or '... told me,' it is possible that, in the report just referred to as an example, there belongs between him and his father some other guarantee, by whom he was told it on his father's authority, and that he himself did not hear it from his father (he having chosen to give the report loosely, without referring it to him from whom he heard it); and, as that possibility exists in respect to Hishâm's reporting 'on the authority of' his father, so again it exists in respect to his father's reporting 'on the authority' of 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious! So must it be, also, with every support to a tradition in which there is no mention made of the reporters having heard it one from another; and, even if it be known, in general, that each one received much oral instruction in tradition from the person whose authority he alleges, still it may be true of each that, in some of his reporting, he even narrates on the ascending grade [by سمعت] without other hearing of the particular tradition than, on the authority of him whom he names, from another; and moreover it may be that he sometimes gave out tradition loosely, 'on the authority of' some individual mentioned, without naming him from whom he really heard it, and sometimes, to avoid looseness, was careful to name the guarantee from whom he actually took it up. Indeed, what we have here suggested is a fact as regards tradition, and has been notoriously practised by reliable traditionists and eminent teachers of the science. We will mention a number of instances of their reporting in the mode referred to—if it be the will of the Supreme God—to serve as examples. One of these is a report of 'as-Sikhiyâni,* 'Ibn 'al-Mubârak,†

* A traditionist of the city of Jurjân, near the southern end of the Caspian Sea, who died A. H. 305. See *Kitâb Tab.*, x. 104.

† One of the most critical traditionists of his time: he died A. H. 181. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 30.

Waki', 'Ibn Namîr,* and several others, on the authority of Hishâm 'Ibn 'Urwah, 'on the authority of' his father, on the authority of 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—namely: 'I was in the habit of perfuming the Messenger of God . . . as well on common as on sacred days, with the most fragrant perfume I could find,' a report which is identically given out by 'al-Laith 'Ibn Sa'd,† Dâ'ûd 'al-Attâr, Humaid Bin 'al-'Aswad, Wuhaib Bin Khâlid, and 'Abû-'Usâmah,‡ on the authority of Hishâm, as having said that he was told it by 'Uthmân Bin 'Urwah, on the authority of 'Urwah, on the authority of 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . . Another report by Hishâm, 'on the authority of' his father, on the authority of 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—is as follows: 'The Prophet . . . in the act of devotion was wont to lean his head towards me, for me to comb it, while I was in my monthly state,' which Mâlik Bin 'Anas reports, identically, on the authority of 'az-Zuhîr, on the authority of 'Urwah, on the authority of 'Anrah, on the authority of 'Â'ishah—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . . Again, it is reported by 'az-Zuhîr and Sîlîh 'Ibn 'Abû-Hassân, on the authority of 'Abû-Salamah, 'on the authority' of 'Â'ishah . . . that 'the Prophet . . . was accustomed to kiss while performing fast,' a traditional statement which Yahya Bin 'Abû-Kathîr§ gives on the subject of kissing, as follows: "'Abû-Salamah Bin 'Abd 'ar-Rahmân told me, that he was told by 'Umar 'Ibn 'Abd 'al-'Azîz, that 'Urwah told him, that he was told by 'Â'ishah . . . that the Prophet . . . was wont to kiss her while performing fast.' Again, it is reported by 'Ibn 'Uyainah || and others, 'on the authority of' 'Amrû Bin Dînâr, on the authority of Jâbir— to whom may God be gracious!—saying: 'The Prophet . . . gave us horseflesh for food, and forbade us to eat the flesh of tame asses,' which Hammâd Bin Zâid¶ reports on the authority of 'Amrû and of Muhammad Bin 'Alî, on the authority of Jâbir . . . on the authority of the Prophet . . . There are many other such reports, which it would take long to enumerate; those here mentioned are sufficient for the intelligent. Now, inasmuch as he whose language we have previously set forth, to the effect that a tradition is corrupt and weak in case it be not known for certain that the reporter heard any tradition from him on whose authority he reports, pretends that, on account of the possibility of looseness in a tradition, one is bound to make no use for legal argumentation of the report of a person of whom we are assured that he heard tradition from him on whose authority he reports, unless this assurance is conveyed in some traditional statement which itself expresses the fact of oral communication by one to the other—it appears from what we have shown of the practice of eminent teachers who have handed down traditional statements, that they sometimes give out a tradition loosely, without mentioning from whom they heard it, and

* Of Kûfah. 'Al-Bukhârî, Muslim, 'Ibn Dâwud, 'Ibn Mâjah and others, are said to have received traditions on his authority. He died A. H. 234. See *Kitâb Tab.*, viii. 26.

† A teacher of 'Ibn 'al-Mubârak in tradition, whose home was Egypt. He died A. H. 175. See *Kitâb Tab.*, v. 52.

‡ Of Kûfah: he died A. H. 201. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 71.

§ Died A. H. 129. See *Kitâb Tab.*, iv. 20.

¶ Of Kûfah, a very exact teacher of tradition, who died A. H. 193. See *Kitâb Tab.*, vi. 19.

|| A traditionist of Bašrah, who died A. H. 179. See *Kitâb Tab.*, v. 55.

sometimes are careful to support the statement in the form of something which they heard, narrating on the ascending grade, if they proceed upwards, and on the descending grade, if they proceed downwards, as we have made it plain that they did.* Moreover, we know of no eminent teacher of primitive times, accustomed to employ traditional statements, and to scrutinize supports with reference to their soundness or unsoundness, equal to 'as-Sikhtiyānī, 'Ibn 'Aun,† Mālik Bin 'Anas, Shu'bāh Bin 'al-Hajjāj, Yahya Bin Sa'īd 'al-Kattān,‡ and 'Abd 'ar-Rahmān 'Ibn Māhdī,§ and the succeeding traditionists who have investigated the matter of the explicit mention of oral communication in the supports of tradition, contended for by him whose language we have set forth; and no one of these was ever wont to inquire whether the reporters of tradition did in fact receive oral instruction from those on whose authority they report, except when a reporter was known to disguise tradition (عَرْفٌ يَأْتِي بِهِ مُنْدَبِسٌ), and noted for doing so. In that case, indeed, the inquiry was instituted whether the individual did report as he had heard, and careful consideration was given to this question, in order to avoid all complicity with disguising. But as to looking into the matter irrespectively of disguised tradition, in the way approved of by him whose language we have stated, we hear of no such thing being practised by those whom we have named, or by any other eminent teacher. 'Abdallāh Bin Yazīd 'al-Anṣārī, who saw the Prophet . . ., for instance, reports 'on the authority of' Hudhaifah and of 'Abū-Mas'ūd 'al-Anṣārī, and 'on the authority of' each one of the two, a tradition which he refers to the Prophet . . ., although, in reporting it on their authority, he makes no mention of having heard it from them, and we do not remember any report which makes it appear that 'Abdallāh 'Ibn Yazīd ever recited tradition as a pupil of Hudhaifah or of 'Abū-Mas'ūd—to both of whom may God be gracious!—nor have we found it explicitly mentioned, in any report, that he ever saw those two persons. No traditionist, either of past time or among ourselves, was ever heard to object to the two traditional statements just referred to, reported by 'Abdallāh 'Ibn Yazīd, on the authority of Hudhaifah and of 'Abū-Mas'ūd, as inherently weak; on the contrary, all persons conversant with tradition, whom we have met, regard these and whatever are like them as being sound and strong in their supports, and approve of using the information thereby transmitted, and of alleging as legal proof the rules (سنن) and reminiscences (روايات) which they convey to us: and yet he whose language we have set forth imagines such statements to be wanting in solidity and precision, until we find out by investigation that the reporter did hear tradition from him on whose authority he reports.

"Were we to proceed to enumerate distinctly all the traditional statements, sound in the opinion of traditionists, which have come down to

* For explanation of the terms "ascending grade" and "descending grade," see p. 79.

† Of Basrah: he died A. H. 151. See *Kitāb Tab.*, iv. 55.

‡ This person is said to have been the leader of the people of 'Irāk in the science of tradition, and to have been deep in criticism respecting reliable authorities. He died A. H. 198. See *Kitāb Tab.*, vi. 49.

§ A traditionist of Basrah, who died A. H. 198. See *Kitāb Tab.*, vii. 1.

us from those whom our author regards as feeble authorities, we should fail to accomplish the undertaking; but we have thought proper to call attention to a number of them, which may serve as a specimen for him whom we herewith make an end of replying to. For instance, 'Abū-'Uthmān 'an-Nahdī and 'Abū-Kāfi' 'as-Sā'igh, who both lived in the days of ignorance, and also had intercourse with the Companions of the Messenger of God . . . who fought at Badr, and so on, and both of whom transmitted traditional statements on their authority, even to citing traditions told by men like 'Abū-Hurairah, 'Ibn 'Umar, and their friends, give out, each of them, a tradition as sustained 'on the authority of' 'Ubaiy Bin Ka'b—to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . . although no one has heard, by any express report, that they two ever saw 'Ubaiy or ever heard any tradition from him. Again, 'Abū-'Amrū 'ash-Shaibānī, who lived in the days of ignorance, and in the time of the Prophet . . . had grown to be a man, as well as 'Abū-Ma'mar 'Abdallāh Bin Sinhabaral, gives out two traditional statements as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abū-Mas'ūd 'al-'Ansārī, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'Ubaid Bin 'Umar, who was born in the time of the Prophet, gives out a tradition as sustained 'on the authority of' 'Ummi Salamah, wife of the Prophet . . ., on the authority of the Prophet; and, again, Kāis Bin 'Abū-Hāzim, a contemporary of the Prophet . . . gives out three traditional statements as sustained 'on the authority of' 'Abū-Mas'ūd 'al-'Ausārī, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'Abd 'ar-Rahmān Bin 'Abū-Laila, who committed traditions to memory on the authority of 'Umar Bin 'al-Khaṭṭāb, and had intercourse with 'Ali—to both of whom may God be gracious!—gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Anas Bin Mālik, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, Rib'i Bin Hirāsh gives out two traditions as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Imrān Bin Hūsain, on the authority of the Prophet . . ., and one tradition 'on the authority of' 'Abū-Bakrah, on the authority of the Prophet . . ., although Rib'i heard tradition from 'Ali Bin 'Abū-Tālib—to whom may God be gracious!—and reports on his authority; and, again, Nāfi' 'Ibn Jubair Bin Muṭ'ām gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abū-Shuraiḥ 'al-Khuza'i, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'an-Nu'mān Bin 'Abū-'Aiyāsh gives out three traditions as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abū-Sa'īd 'al-Khudī— to whom may God be gracious!—on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, 'Aṭā' 'Ibn Yazid 'ad-Daithī gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' Tamīm 'ad-Dārī, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, Sulāmān Bin Yasār gives out a tradition as sustained, 'on the authority of' Rāfi' 'Ibn Khadīj, on the authority of the Prophet . . .; and, again, Humāid Bin 'Abd 'ar-Rahmān 'al-Himyarī gives out traditions as sustained, 'on the authority of' 'Abū-Hurairah, on the authority of the Prophet . . .

"Now, as for all these followers of the Prophet in the second degree, whose reporting 'on the authority of' Companions whom we have named is here noticed, there is no express memorial, so far as we know, in any report, of their having heard tradition from those whom they refer to as their authorities, nor, in any traditional statement itself, of their having ever met them; and yet the supports referred to are held to be sound by

those familiar with traditional statements and reports, who have never, to our knowledge, regarded any of them as weak, nor sought to make out in regard to them the fact of oral communication from one to another of the reporters, inasmuch as each one of them may possibly have heard tradition from his given authority, without any absurdity, because, living at the period they did, they were in habits of intercourse with the Companions.

"This new-fangled talk of our author which we have set forth, to the effect that tradition is rendered weak by the cause alleged, is too trifling to be long dwelt upon, or brought prominently into notice, forasmuch as it is an innovation, and a wrong-headed way of treating the subject, which no primitive traditionist ever gave expression to, and those of later times know nothing of. We therefore need not add anything by way of refutation of it, the opinion expressed having no more force than we have represented, either in itself or as advocated by our author. May God prosper the setting aside of whatever is opposed to the views of our doctors—in Him is my confidence!"

To these contributions to our knowledge of the science of Muslim tradition we add two extracts from H. and J., which introduce us to the collections of tradition in highest repute among the Muslims, and furnish some dates of importance in the history of the science, already, however, in part anticipated by notes on preceding pages. Our first extract is from H.*

فصل

لما تفارقت مراتب الصحيح والضلال بعضها أصبح من بعض فاعلم أن الذي تقرر عند جمهور الحديثين أن صحيح البخاري مقدم على ساير المتنب المصنفة حتى قالوا أصبح المتنب بعد كتاب الله صحيح البخاري وبعض المغاربة رجحوا صحيح المسلم على صحيح البخاري والجمهور يقولون أن هذا فيما يرجع إلى حسن البيان وجوده الوضييع والترتيب ورعاية دقائق الاشارات ومحاسن التكاث في الاسانيد وهذا خارج عن المبحث والكلام في الصحافة والقوة وما يتعلق بها وليس كتاب يساري صحيح البخاري في هذا الباب بدلليل كمال الصفات التي اعتبرت في الصحافة في رجاله وبعضهم توقف في ترجيح أحدهما على الآخر والحق هو الاول والحديث الذي اتفق البخاري ومسلم على تخرجه يسمى متفقا عليه وقال الشیخ بشرط ان يكون عن حبابی واحد و قالوا مجموع الاحادیث المتفقة عليها الغان وثلاثمائة وستة وعشرون و باملجلاة ما اتفق عليه الشیخان مقدم على غيره ثم ما تفرد به

* fol. 8, rect. and vers.

البخاري ثُمَّ ما تفرد به مسلم ثُمَّ ما كان على شرط البخاري ومسلم ثُمَّ ما هو على شرط البخاري ثُمَّ ما هو على شرط مسلم ثُمَّ ما هو رواه من غيره من الآية الذين التزموا الصحّة وتحمّلوه فالقسام سبعة والمراد بشرط البخاري ومسلم أن يكون الرجال متصفين بالصفات التي يتتصف بها رجال البخاري ومسلم من الضبط والعدالة وعدم الشذوذ والنكارة والغفلة وقيل المراد بشرط البخاري ومسلم رجال انفسهم والتللام في هذا طوبل ذكرناه في مقدمة شرح سفر السعادة

فصل

الاحاديث الصحيحة لم تنحصر في صحيح البخاري ومسلم ولم يستوعبها الصحاح كلها بل ^فما منحصران في الصحاح والصحاح التي عندما وعلى شرطهما ايضا لم يوردها في كتابيهما فضلاً عما عند غيرهما قال البخاري ما أوردت في كتابي هذا إلا ما صحّ ولقد تركت كثيرًا من الصحاح وقال مسلم الذي أوردت في هذا الكتاب من الاحاديث صحيح ولا أقول أن ما تركت ضعيف ولا بد أن يكون في هذا الترک والاتيان وجه تخصيص الابرار والترک اما من جهة الصحاح او من جهة مقاصد اخر والحاكم ابو عبد الله النيساپوري صنف كتابا سماه المستدرک بمعنى ان ما تركه البخاري ومسلم من الصحاح اوردہ في هذا الكتاب وتلاؤه واستدرک بعضها على شرط الشیخین وبعضها على شرط احدما وبعضها على غير شرطهما وقال ان البخاري ومسلمما لم يجحبا بانه ليس احاديث صحيحه غير ما خرجاه في هذين الكتابين وقال قد حدث في عصرنا هذا فرقۃ من المبتدةة اشالوا المستنهم بالطبع على آیة الدين يان مجموع ما صحّ عندكم من الاحاديث لم يبلغ زعاء عشرة الاف ونقل عن البخاري انه قال حفظت من الصحاح مائة الف حديث ومن غير الصحاح مائة الف والظاهر والله اعلم انه يزيد الصحاح على شرطه ومبلاع ما أورد في هذا الكتاب مع التكرار سبعة الاف ومائتين وخمس وسبعين حديث وبعد حذف التكرار اربعة الاف ولقد صنف الاخرون من الآية حجاجا مثل حجاج ابن حزيمة الذي يقال له امام الآية وهو شیخ ابن حبان وقال ابن حبان في مدحه ما رأیت على وجه الارض احدا احسن في صناعة السنن واحفظ للاحتفاظ الصحيحة

منه كان السنن والاحاديث كلها نصب عينه وممثل صحيح ابن حبان تلميذ ابن حزيمة ثقة فاضل امام فهام وقال الحاكم كان ابن حبان من اوعية العلم واللغة والحديث والوعظ وكان من عقلاه الرجال وممثل صحيح الحاكم ابي عبد الله النيسابوري الحافظ الثقة المسمى بالمستدرك وقد تطرق في كتابه هذا التساهل واخذوا عليه وقالوا ابن حزيمة وابن حبان امكنا واقوى من الحاكم واحسن والطف في الاسانيد والمنون وممثل المختار للحافظ ضياء الدين المقدسي وهو ايضا خرج معاها لم يست في الصاححين وقالوا كتابه احسن من المستدرك وممثل صحيح ابن عوانة وابن السكن والمنتقى لابن جارود وهذه الكتب كلها مختصة بالصحيح ولكن جماعة انتقدوا عليها تعصبا وانصافا وفوق كل ذى علم عليم والله اعلم

فصل

الكتب الستة المشهورة المقررة في الاسلام التي يقال لها الصحيح الست في صحيح البخاري و صحيح مسلم والجامع للترمذى والسنن لابى داود وسنن ابن ماجة وعند البعض الموطا بدل ابن ماجة وصاحب جامع الاصول اختار الموطا وفي هذه الكتب الاربعة اقسام من الاحاديث من الصحيح والحسان والضعاف وتسميتها بالصحيح الستة بطريق التغليب وسمى صاحب المصايخ احاديث غير الشياخين بالحسان وهو قريب من هذا الوجه قريب المعنى اللغوى او هو اصطلاح جديد منه وقال بعضهم كتاب الدارمى احرى واليق بجعله سادس الكتب لأن رجاله اقل ضعفا وجود الدارمی المنكرة والشاذة فيه نادر وله اسانيد عالية وثلاثياته اكثر من ثلاثيات البخارى وهذه المذكورات من الكتب اشهر الكتب وغيرها من الكتب كثرة شهرة ولقد اورد السيوطي في كتاب جميع الجواجم من كتب كثيرة يتتجاوز خمسين مشتملة على الصحيح والحسان والضعاف وقال ما اوردت فيها حديثا موسوما بالوضع انفق الحدثون على تر��ة وردة والله اعلم وذكر صاحب المشكوة في ديباجة كتابه جماعة من الایمة المتقيين وهم البخارى ومسلم والامام مالك والامام الشافعى والامام احمد بن حنبل والترمذى وابو داود والنسائى وابن ماجة والدارمی والدارقطنی والبیهقی ودرزین واجمل في ذكر غيرهم وكتبنا احوالهم في كتاب مفرد مسمى بالاكمال بذكر اسماء الرجال ومن الله التوفيق وهو المستعلن في المبداء والمنال

“Section.

“Since the grades of sound tradition differ one from another, and some sound traditions are sounder than others, be it known that the *Sahih* of ‘al-Bukhārī is established in the estimation of traditionists as superior to all other books of human authorship, so that, as they say, ‘the *Sahih* of ‘al-Bukhārī is the most perfect of books, next to the Book of God.’ Some of the people of the West, however, attach greater weight to Muslim’s *Sahih* than to that of ‘al-Bukhārī; though every one says that this preference is based upon particulars relative to nicety of expression, together with the fullness of that collection, the arrangement, and the preservation, in the supports, of references to minute points and nice distinctive marks—all which is aside from the subject-matter, and has nothing to do with the question of the soundness and strength of a tradition, and points therewith connected, as regards which there is no book equal to the *Sahih* of ‘al-Bukhārī, since the guarantees whom he relies upon unite every quality taken into account with reference to soundness of tradition. Others, again, hesitate about preferring either of the two to the other. The true view is the first which we have stated.

“That tradition which both Muslim and ‘al-Bukhārī give out is said to be agreed upon (متفق), ‘provided,’ as the Shaikh says, ‘it be given on the authority of one and the same witness of the Prophet;’ and the traditions thus agreed upon are said to amount, in number, to two thousand three hundred and twenty-six. To be brief, that which the two masters agree upon is preferred to all other tradition; next comes that which ‘al-Bukhārī alone gives out; then, that which Muslim alone gives out; then, that which answers to the stipulation of both ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim; then, that which answers to the stipulation of ‘al-Bukhārī alone; then, that which answers to the stipulation of Muslim alone; and lastly, that which is reported by other eminent teachers strenuous for soundness, and which they regard as sound. There are, therefore, seven subdivisions. The force of the expression: ‘stipulation of ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim’ is that the given guarantees of a tradition were characterized by those qualities which the guarantees relied upon by ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim possessed, namely, retentiveness, integrity, and freedom from separateness, indeterminateness, and carelessness. Another explanation of the expression: ‘stipulation of ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim’ is this, that it denotes an identity of the guarantees of a tradition with those whom they two rely upon. The discussion of this point has been drawn out to a great length: we have given an account of it in the introduction to the *Commentary on the Book of Felicity* (شرح سفر السعاد).

“Section.

“Sound traditions are not confined to the *Sahihs* of ‘al-Bukhārī and Muslim, nor are these two works all the *Sahihs*. On the contrary, these are two among the *Sahihs*; nor do their authors bring forward, in the two books, all those traditions which, in their opinion and according to their stipulation, are sound, to say nothing of such as are sound in the view of others than themselves. Says ‘al-Bukhārī: ‘I have brought forward, in this my book, nothing but sound tradition, and have also left

out many traditions which are sound ;' and Muslim says : 'Whatever traditions I have brought forward in this book are sound, while I do not say that what I have left out is weak tradition.' Yet, doubtless, in this leaving out and bringing forward there was that sort of particularization which belongs to those acts, either in respect to soundness or in respect to some other points kept in view. 'Al-Hâkim 'Abû-'Abdallâh 'an-Nisâpûrî composed a book which he called the *Repaired Sahîh* (الْمُسْتَدْرِكُ)، a name signifying that in this book were brought forward by him sound traditions which 'al-Bukhârî and Muslim had left out, mended and repaired, some according to the stipulation of both of the two masters, others according to the stipulation of one or other of the two, and others still according to other stipulation than theirs;* and this author says that 'al-Bukhârî and Muslim did not judge other traditions than those which they brought forward in their two books to be unsound,' adding : 'for all that this has been asserted, in our time, by a party of the "Innovating Sect," who have protruded their tongues in reproach against the eminent teachers of religion, with the words : "All the traditions which are sound, in your view, do not come up to the number of ten thousand." ' Moreover, 'al-Bukhârî himself is reported to have said : 'I have committed to memory one hundred thousand sound traditions, and two hundred thousand unsound'—and it is plain, and God knows, that he means to speak of that which is sound according to his own stipulation—whereas the sum total of what he has brought forward in his book, repetition included, is seven thousand two hundred and seventy-five traditions, and, exclusive of repetition, four thousand.

"*Sahîhs* have been composed, also, by later eminent teachers, for example: the *Sahîh* of 'Ibn Hazimah,† surnamed the 'Imâm of 'Imâms, who was the master of 'Ibn Hibbân, and in praise of whom 'Ibn Hibbân says : 'I have not seen, on the face of the earth, any one of nicer perception with regard to what constitutes a traditional law, or whose memory was more stored with sound memorials—all traditional laws and traditions were present to his mind ;' and the *Sahîh* of 'Ibn Hibbân,‡ the pupil of 'Ibn Hazimah, a reliable authority of superior qualifications, an eminent teacher of high intelligence, of whom 'al-Hâkim says : 'Ibn Hibbân was a repository of learning, a living dictionary, a store-house of tradition and instruction in duty, and a man of genius,' and that called the *Repaired Sahîh*, by 'al-Hâkim 'Abû-'Abdallâh 'an-Nisâpûrî, the memorizer, the reliable authority, whose book has, to its injury, that want of strict legitimacy which we have referred to, and to whom people have made the objection that 'Ibn Hazimah and 'Ibn Hibbân are of more weight and stronger than 'al-Hâkim, as well as more nice and elegantly discriminating in respect to supports and texts; and the *Selection from the Sahîh* (الْمُخْتَرُ)، by the memorizer Dhiyâ' 'ad-Dîn 'al-Makdâsi,§ who also brought out sound traditions which are not in the *Sahîhs* of

* A similar account of this book is given by Hâjî Khalfah, v. 521, who puts the death of the author A. H. 405.

† Died A. H. 311. His *Sahîh* is mentioned by Hâjî Khalfah, iv. 99.

‡ See *Hâjî Khalf. Lex.*, iv. 99.

§ Mentioned by Hâjî Khalfah, v. 440, who gives for the title of the work *'al-Mukhtârah fi 'al-Hadîth*, and says that the author died A. H. 643.

'al-Bukhārī and Muslim, whose book is said to be more nice than the *Repaired Sahīh*; and the *Sahīh* of 'Abū-'Awānah and that of 'Ibn 'as-Sakan,* and the *Marrow of the Sahīh* (المنقى), by 'Ibn Jārūd.† All these books are designated as *Sahīhs*, though a certain set of persons discriminate with regard to them, as well in the spirit of strenuous purism as with impartial criticism—there is one who knows, superior to all instructed men—God knows.

“Section.

“The six books, universally known and of established authority within the pale of Islām, called the *Six Sahīhs*, are the *Sahīh* of 'al-Bukhārī, the *Sahīh* of Muslim, the *Jāmi'* of 'at-Tarmidhī, the *Sunan* of 'Abū-Dāwud, the *Sunan* of 'Ibn Mājah,‡ and the *Muwatta'*—which last is by some put in the place of 'Ibn Mājah's collection, and was preferred by the author of the *Jāmi'* 'al-Uṣūl. But these last named four books embrace traditions of more than one class, namely, both sound, fair, and weak: the *Six Sahīhs* are so named by way of ascribing to them a certain superiority; and the author of the *Masālīh* calls all traditions given out by others than the two masters fair, which is a derived form of expression, either allied to the usage of that term in common parlance, or being a new technical application of it on the part of the author. Some persons say that the book of 'ad-Dārimī§ is more worthy and suitable to be ranked as the sixth book, because fewer guarantees marked by any weakness are relied upon in it, and traditions undetermined, or separate, are rarely introduced, while it has some supports of a superior character, and its trebly supported traditions (ثلاثيات) are more numerous than those of 'al-Bukhārī.||

“These which we have mentioned are the most noted books of tradition; but others are in extensive repute. Indeed, 'as-Suyūṭī, in the *Kitāb Jāmi'* 'aj-Jawāmī', cites many books, to the number of more than forty, as containing both sound, fair, and weak traditions, and says: 'I have not brought out, as contained in either book, any tradition to which is attached the stigma of being made up, which traditionists have agreed to leave out and reject—God knows.' The author of the *Mishkāt*, also, in the preface to his book, mentions a multitude of eminent teachers of tradition, of devout lives, namely: 'al-Bukhārī, Muslim, the eminent teacher Mālik, the eminent teacher 'ash-Shāfi'i, the eminent teacher 'Ahmad Bin Hanbal, 'at-Tarmidhī, 'Abū-Dāwud, 'an-Nasa'i, 'Ibn Mājah, 'ad-Dārimī, 'ad-Dārakutnī, 'al-Baihākī, Razīn, etc., about whom we have written in a special book entitled the *Complete Statement of the Names of the Guarantees of Tradition* (الإكمال بذك أسماء الرجال)—depending upon God's providence, and asking His aid from first to last.”

* The *Sahīh* of 'Ibn 'as-Sakan, who died A. H. 353, is called by Hājī Khalfah 'as-Sahīh 'al-Muntaka. See iv. 99, 100. The work of 'Abū-'Awānah here referred to appears to be an epitome of Muslim's *Musnad*, entitled *Mustakhraj 'Abi'Awānah*: the author died A. H. 316. See Hājī Khalf. *Lex.*, v. 520.

† See Hājī Khalf. *Lex.*, vi. 167.

‡ See Hājī Khalf. *Lex.*, iii. 621. The author died A. H. 273.

§ Entitled *Musnad 'ad-Dārimī*. The author died A. H. 253. See *Kitāb Tab.*, ix. 17 and Hājī Khalf. *Lex.*, v. 539.

|| There is another work by 'ad-Dārimī, entitled *Thalāthiyāt 'ad-Dārimī*. See Hājī Khalf. *Lex.*, ii. 492.

Our last extract is from J.:*

الباب الرابع
في أسماء الرجال

الصحابي مسلم رأى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال الأصوليون من ظالت مجالسته والتابعى كل مسلم صاحب صاحبها وقيل من نقية وهو الاظهر والبحث عن تفاصيل الأسماء والكتاب والألقاب والمراتب في العلم والودع لهاتين المرتبتين وما بعدهما يفصى الى تصلويل توقي مالك بالمدينه سنة تسع وسبعين ومائة وولد سنة ثلث او احدى او اربع او سبع وتسعين وابو حنيفة ببغداد سنة خمسين ومائة وكان ابن سبعين والشافعى ببصرة سنة اربع ومائتين وولد سنة خمسين ومائة واحمد بن حنبل ببغداد سنة احدى واربعين ومائتين وولد سنة اربع وستين ومائة والبخارى ولد يوم الجمعة لثلاث عشرة خلت من شوال سنة اربع وتسعين ومائة ومات ليلة الفطر سنة ست وخمسين ومائتين بقرية خرتنك من بخارا ومسلم مات بنيسابور سنة احدى وستين ومائين وكان ابن خمس وخمسين وابو داود بالبصرة سنة سبع وسبعين ومائين والتزمى مات بترمذ سنة تسع وسبعين ومائين والنسائى سنة ثلث وثلاثمائة والدارقطنى ببغداد سنة خمس وثمانين وثلاثمائة وولد بها سنة ست وثلاثمائة والحاكم بنيسابور سنة خمس واربع مائة وولد بها سنة احدى وعشرين وثلاثمائة والبيهقى ولد سنة اربع وثلاثين وثلاثمائة ومات بنيسابور سنة ثمان وخمسين وأربعين مائة تمت الرسالة

“ Chapter Fourth.

“ Names of Guarantees.

“ The term ‘witness’ (الصحابي) denotes any Muslim who saw the Prophet . . . , or, as the professed teachers of the foundations of religion say, one who had long sittings with him; and the term ‘follower in the second degree’ (التابعى) means any Muslim who was associated with, or, as is also said, who met, a witness. So much is most plain. But to look into all the distinctions of names, titles, epithets, and degrees, which belong to the science, and to apply them to these and the succeeding orders of reporters, would be a long affair.

“Mālik died at Madinah in the year 179, and was born in 93, or 91, or 94, or 97. ‘Abū Ḥanifah died at Baghdād in 150, aged seventy years. ‘Ash-Shāfi‘i died in Egypt in 204, and was born in 150. ‘Ahmad Bin Ḥanbal died at Baghdād in 241, and was born in 164. ‘Al-Bukhārī was born on Friday, the 13th of Shauwāl, in the year 194, and died on the night of the festival succeeding Ramadhan, in the year 256, in the city of Khartān in Bukhārā. Muslim died at Nisābūr in 261, aged fifty-five years. ‘Abū-Dāwud died at ‘al-Baṣrah in 277. ‘At-Tarmidhī died at Tarmidh in 279. ‘An-Nasā‘i died in the year 303. ‘Ad-Dāra-kutnī died at Baghdād in 385, and was born there in 306. ‘Al-Hākim died at Nisābūr in 405, and was born there in 321. ‘Al-Baihākī was born in 334, and died at Nisābūr in 458.

“End of the treatise, etc.”